

The intricate maneuvering that brought this result took place at the recent annual Communist congress, where Luigi Longo, ex-World War resistance leader and now secretary general of the party, asserted his dominance. In the process, he crushed the hard-liner, Pietro Ingrao, and got an apologetic retreat from the soft-liner, Giorgio Amendola, who wanted to see the Communists make a deal with the left-center.

The twists and turns inside the PCI are important only because the Italian Communists are important. Although party membership has shown a gradual drop in the last decade, the Communists have steadily gained popular votes and seats in Parliament. In the 1963 general election the PCI won 25.3 percent of the votes and 166 out of 630 seats in the Chamber of Deputies. Only the Christian Democrats—who lost votes and seats in the election—have a larger representation.

The paradox in Italy, as in France, is that the nation can absorb such a large foreign body in its political structure and remain a democracy. There is no reason to expect the Communists to weaken in the next 2 years, but neither is there any reason to expect them to gain power. Italy has proved that in a country which defends its free institutions, keeps the extremists more or less isolated while leaving them free, and adapts relatively advanced social and economic programs, neither communism nor fascism can win popular majorities.

A Vital Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, typical of many editorials praising the efforts being made by my longtime friend, Vice President HUMPHREY, on his swing to several Far Eastern capitals was one of February 10 in the Long Island Newsday, which declared that Mr. HUMPHREY, "an able assistant to his chief, is carrying on for President Johnson in implementing political, economic, and social progress for South Vietnam."

His trip is designed to inform several governments "of the magnitude of the Johnson program for help to the South Vietnamese as well as the corollary military program for expediting progress in the war."

The editorial sums up very clearly the importance of the Vice President's trip, and I, therefore, wish to include the article in the RECORD:

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Newsday, Feb. 10, 1966]

HUMPHREY'S VITAL TRIP

Vice President HUMPHREY, an able assistant to his chief, is carrying on for President Johnson in implementing political, economic, and social progress for South Vietnam. His trip will take him from that war-torn country to India, Australia, Malaysia, Thailand, and Japan, all of whose governments will be informed firsthand of the magnitude of the Johnson program for help to the South Vietnamese as well as the corollary military program for expediting progress in the war.

This is a vital trip, and a prompt follow-up to the Declaration of Honolulu, which succinctly restated the American position, reassured the Vietnamese that we seek only their right to self-determination, and advised those under the sway of Ho Chi Minh that we intend to stick by our ally until a truce or an American-South Vietnamese triumph has occurred. The Vice President has a task worthy of his mettle. We wish him the very best.

One Hundred Urban Affairs Experts Stress Importance of Funding Rent Supplement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that one of the first major actions of this session of Congress will be to fulfill President Johnson's request for funds to put the rent supplement program into effect.

Recently 100 experts in urban problems endorsed a letter to President Johnson emphasizing the great importance of the rent supplement program. The letter, from Leon Shull, national director of the Americans for Democratic Action, calls the rent supplement program "the most important new initiative in housing policy to aid low-income families since 1949."

I believe this letter and the list of endorsers will be of interest:

FEBRUARY 11, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We believe that the rent supplement program adopted by the Congress in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is the most important new initiative in housing policy to aid low-income families since 1949. If the rent supplement program is adequately funded, and is used in our metropolitan areas—cities and suburbs—it will be a basic tool to eliminate slum housing in which so many of our poor now live.

Regrettably the House of Representatives failed to appropriate funds for this program. While the Senate appropriated funds, the program was not funded. Until the rent subsidy program is funded it cannot aid low-income families in their housing needs.

The purpose of the rent subsidy program is to aid low-income families who are either physically handicapped, elderly, occupy substandard housing, or have been displaced by governmental action. The legislation assures that only low-income families will receive the program's benefits.

Since eligibility for the rent supplement program is limited to the maximum income permissible for public housing occupancy, to suggest that rent supplement is not a program to benefit low-income families, as the bill's opponents have, grossly distorts the real facts.

Low-income families invariably spend more proportionately per unit for housing than other families; a family earning a low income is often forced to spend as much as 35 percent of their income on housing. We believe that the rent supplement program is a valuable tool precisely because it lowers

rent costs for low-income families while at the same time provides such families with decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

As important as funding the rent subsidy program is, it is necessary that the program be allowed to function as Congress intended it—without undue restrictions. In 1965, however, the House Appropriations Committee limited the use of the funds of the rent subsidy program by requiring that rent subsidy program projects must be "either part of a workable program or * * * have been officially approved by the local community concerned."

These restrictions are unwise public policy, and will severely cripple the rent supplement program. Many communities do not have workable programs. Also, since the rent subsidy program does not involve a matching grant, local officials should not be in the position of having a veto power over a program that neither involves local officials administratively nor financially.

Mr. President, the legislative solution is obvious. To end blight and increase decent, safe, and sanitary housing requires funding the rent supplement program, and without restrictions. We respectfully request your public support on this matter as a major administration priority. Its success will be a great victory in the war against poverty and an end to slum housing.

Attached is a list of endorsers of this letter. Their organizational and institutional affiliations are listed for identification purposes only.

Respectfully yours,

LEON SHULL,
National Director.

ENDORSERS OF RENT SUBSIDY LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

John Anderson, attorney, San Francisco, Calif.

Ellis Ash, administrator, Boston Housing Authority, Stoneham, Mass.

David Baum, assistant professor of law, College of Law, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Henry C. Beertiz, attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Besheres, associate professor of sociology, MIT, Newton, Mass.

Richard F. Bolan, assistant to the director, Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Mass.

Richard H. Buford, commissioner of licenses and inspection, Philadelphia, Pa.

Terry Chisholm, executive director, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, Philadelphia, Pa.

Carla Cohen, city planner, Washington, D.C.

Theodore Coggs, former president, National Bar Association, Milwaukee, Wis.

M. Todd Cooke, Jr., banker, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harvey Cox, associate professor, Harvard Divinity School, Boston, Mass.

Robert Craft, inner city development project, Milwaukee, Wis.

Louis Danzig, executive director, Newark Housing Authority, Newark, N.J.

Paul Davidoff, chairman, department of city planning, Hunter College, New York, N.Y.

Terry Dellmuth, public welfare consultant, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. Cushing Dolbeare, managing director, Philadelphia Housing Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

James R. Dumpson, chairman, Hunter School of Social Work, Hunter College, New York, N.Y.

Edward Eichler, California homebuilder, San Francisco, Calif.

Maurice Fagan, executive director, Fellowship Commission, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bernard Farber, professor, department of sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

OUR NEW WAR—ANTI-INFLATION

Only a few short weeks ago, spokesmen for the Johnson administration were busily denying that inflation constitutes a real danger to the booming U.S. economy.

The President sang a different and more realistic tune in his annual economic report to Congress Thursday. He warned that inflation could eat up the fruits of the American economic miracle and served notice that he will seek higher taxes if necessary to keep it under control.

Nobody likes to pay taxes. But, as Mr. Johnson observed, inflation reduces the purchasing power of our paychecks just as surely as a tax increase. And it bears more heavily on those in lower income brackets, who are least able to pay.

Any increase in individual and corporate income taxes should be held off, however, until other less drastic anti-inflationary weapons have been tried.

Certainly the Federal Government should exercise the same kind of economic restraint which President Johnson is asking from business and organized labor.

In preparing to fight inflation, it helps to understand how our economy arrived at its present healthy but overheating state.

Five years ago, unemployment was high and the Nation's factories were operating well under capacity. To promote prosperity and put more people to work, Washington cut taxes and spent freely.

Whether in response to this medicine or from its own native vigor, the U.S. economy has surged to unprecedented levels of prosperity.

Unemployment is approaching the lowest level in 13 years. Profits and wages are up, and our gross national product is growing faster than that of any major industrial country in the world.

Now the problem has become one of restraint rather than growth. Labor shortages are cropping up in certain skills, and manufacturers are operating at or near capacity.

Under these pressures, prices are going up—sharply so in the last few weeks.

As the President noted, these are problems of prosperity which other countries may well envy. Nevertheless, if we are to keep our society strong and growing, and avoid a return to wartime controls on wages and prices, the inflationary threat must be dealt with.

Mr. Johnson has already asked Congress to pass legislation speeding collection of present income taxes, and reimposing certain excise taxes which expired only recently.

Beyond that, his spokesmen are telling both business and labor that it is more important than ever for them to keep wages and prices within the suggested Federal guidelines.

That is, wage increases should be held to 3.2 percent per year, and employers should absorb payroll increases of this size without raising prices.

Both business and labor must strive to stay within these guidelines, if stronger medicine is to be avoided. However, the country has a right to expect some restraint and purposeful action on the Government's part, too.

First, the President should employ his persuasive powers just as strongly against excessive union demands as against unwarranted price increases. He has not done so to date. Demands for higher Federal spending must be resisted, except for defense purposes.

A further tightening of credit and the money supply should be considered by monetary authorities. The average citizen should spend less and save more.

If serious inflation nevertheless develops, income tax increases may be necessary. But they should be levied on a temporary basis, with the understanding that the revenue will not be used to generate more inflation through more Government spending.

The money, instead, should be used to hold down the deficit or perhaps even reduce the national debt.

National Park in the Cascades**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to discover an editorial in last Sunday's New York Times recognizing the unique and as yet unspoiled natural landscape values of the North Cascades Mountains of Washington State.

In a timely editorial this great newspaper pays just tribute to those who have been crusading for years to preserve this region from commercial exploitation by establishment of a new national park—a project which in principle I have favored.

Right now conflicting pressures are being exerted in connection with implementation of the recent Agriculture and Interior Departments' study of mass recreation needs in this area. In this regard, I must concur with the hope expressed by the Times that something closer to perfection than the recommendations of the new study will be achieved.

One aspect of the current controversy which must be resolved is overlooked by the Times; namely, a related proposal to adjust the boundaries of the Olympic National Park. Special care, it seems to me, should be exercised to assure that in any compromise with commercial interests, existing conservation achievements not be jeopardized.

Meanwhile, I am happy indeed that progress toward new legislation is being made. It is highly desirable that the administration make its proposals known and that Congress give them expeditious consideration.

Following is the text of the New York Times editorial referred to which deserves to be read by all Members of Congress:

NATIONAL PARK IN THE CASCADES

After 2½ years of careful inquiry and tense bureaucratic negotiations, the Agriculture and Interior Departments have joined in recommending the creation of a new national park in the North Cascade Mountains in the State of Washington. But the agreement is fragile and incomplete, and some of the compromises at the heart of the report are damaging.

The area under consideration, more than a million acres east of Seattle and stretching north to the Canadian border, is an incomparably beautiful part of the Nation's landscape. Sometimes called the American Alps, this region has rugged, towering peaks, glaciers, snow and ice fields, Alpine meadows, brilliant lakes, and fast-running rivers. If ever there was a region of the country deserving of full protection as a national park, the North Cascades is that region.

Controversy arises because the area is rich in timber, much of it in national forests under the administration of the Agriculture Department's Forest Service. Since the For-

est Service's multiple-use policy permits profitable logging operations, the private lumber companies have long opposed a park. And since a park would be under the control of the Department of the Interior, the Agriculture Department is reluctant to yield jurisdiction. These two interests have been joined by a third—local business groups who want the area more intensively developed for mass recreation. The compromises in the report reflect these conflicting pressures.

The report recommends a national park of 698,000 acres, only half the size originally envisaged by the National Park Service, and leaving the other half—the spectacular Glacier Peak Wilderness—under Forest Service control. But Glacier Peak is the most superb section of the Cascades; it can be kept as a wilderness area and still be given park protection.

Unfortunately, the study team proposes to draw the boundaries to include dams within the park. Generating plants have rarely if ever been permitted within the confines of a national park; and their inclusion here would set a wretched precedent.

In deference to the local tourist industry, the report proposes helicopter service and chairlift lines as well as many new roads into the higher mountain country. The former would be innovations in a national park—and uniformly bad ones—entirely contrary to the whole idea of parks as natural preserves.

As recently as 5 years ago prospects for getting a park seemed poor. That the proposal has advanced this far is a tribute to the tireless crusading of the Sierra Club and the North Cascades Conservation Council and to the mediating efforts of Edward C. Crafts, chairman of the study team. But the unique value of the North Cascades commands effort to bring this proposal still closer to perfection.

"Why" We're There**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post says quite plainly that we should keep our attention on the central reason of "why" we are in Vietnam, and it adds that Senator GALE McGEE is right in calling a "rambling debate over Vietnam a potential danger to our understanding of the conflict."

The Post noted that a discursive argument is one that digresses, and it adds that:

Such debates—over what a general really meant or what Hanoi radio really is trying to say (beneath the surface)—should not be allowed to obscure more relevant discussion.

Because I find the guidelines offered here very helpful, I ask permission of my colleagues that the article be made a part of the RECORD:

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 9, 1966]

SOME GUIDELINES ON VIETNAM DEBATE

Senator GALE McGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, is right in calling the rambling debate over Vietnam a potential danger to our understanding of the conflict. He says, "specifically, that the question of why we are in Vietnam is the important one"—and that we

shouldn't get bogged down in a series of "discursive" arguments.

A discursive argument is one that digresses. We're sure that McGEE, a former university professor, has seen enough discursive student essays to be at home with the word.

A student, conceivably, may digress in the hope he will confuse his teacher into believing he knows the answer. Possibly the same motivation is involved in some of the criticism of President Johnson.

The problem, as Senator McGEE sees it, is that hundreds of minor things are brought into major debate. And sometimes major issues are twisted into questionable directions.

An example of the latter is the reaction to Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin's now famous letter to Harper's magazine last month. Gavin expressed some disagreement with the administration's Asia policy. He was supposed to favor retreating to coastal enclaves.

But the result was that Gavin was so widely misunderstood—and so widely hailed as an opponent of President Johnson's policies—that Gavin said last week he's sorry he committed the ideas to paper.

Gavin explained: "I did not suggest we withdraw to the enclaves; I said that where we are now, we have these enclaves, and if we stay with what we have * * * we can either hold on or consolidate in several large areas or one large area."

"This is not necessarily bad military logic—as some Johnson supporters say it is—nor is it proof that Gavin is unalterably opposed to Johnson's Asia policy. He told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Tuesday, for example, that he approved the resumption of bombing in North Vietnam.

So what finally emerges is a warning by an experienced military man that we cannot fight a land war with China all over south-east Asia. That's good advice—if the administration is planning such a course.

And it's worth discussing. But we wonder if there isn't a lot of ideological hysteria—masquerading as a search for logic—involved in the Vietnam policy discussions at the civilian level.

Such debates—over what a general really meant or what Rand radio really is trying to say (beneath the surface)—should not be allowed to obscure more relevant discussion. Such discussion, Senator McGEE says, should include a background realization of why we are in Vietnam and how our involvement there fits into "the full screen of global politics." His point is worth considering.

World Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in his humane and wise efforts to relieve world hunger, President Johnson is being hailed as a statesman in the highest sense of the word.

His policies in this field came in for high praise from columnist James Reston who, in the New York Times, declared that when the history of this postwar generation is written the quiet and generous policies of the American Government will stand out above its other exploits.

Reston stated:

Nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

He is no longer thinking of the Nation's food surpluses as a problem but as an opportunity. He is not talking now about taking more acreage out of production but of putting some of the 60 million land bank acres back into production, and in the process, he is likely to prove that this is not only good agricultural policy, but good foreign policy and social policy at the same time.

Reston is convinced that the war to relieve world hunger appeals greatly to President Johnson. He has a feeling for the land and the poor—having come from both—that comes through in his food and poverty messages more clearly than any others; and in emphasizing them, both at home and abroad, he is establishing a record that may in the end be the symbol of his administration.

The column by James Reston follows:
[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1966]

WASHINGTON: FIGHT 'EM OR FEED 'EM?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 10.—There is a kind of Gresham's law of journalism in which the bad news drives out the good, the negative overwhelms the positive, and the warmakers drown out the peacemakers.

Yet when the history of this postwar generation is written, the quiet and generous policies of the American Government are likely to stand out even above its military exploits, and nothing illustrates the point better than President Johnson's new efforts to relieve world hunger.

He is no longer thinking of the Nation's food surpluses as a problem but as an opportunity. He is not talking now about taking more acreage out of production but of putting some of the 60 million land bank acres back into production, and in the process, he is likely to prove that this is not only good agricultural policy, but good foreign policy and social policy at the same time.

ROOSEVELT'S FORESIGHT

Here is a field in which the United States has dealt consistently and generously with the causes of war—from the Marshall plan to the Johnson plan. It is just over 20 years ago that Franklin Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter pledge of "Freedom From Want" was given substance in the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Since that time, the net total of U.S. economic aid to other countries was over \$65 billion, and in the last decade U.S. aid programs have provided over 140 million tons of food for needy nations.

THREAT OF FAMINE

Nevertheless, world food shortages are greater than ever. With the human population increasing by 63 million every year, and food production not keeping up, there is a serious threat of famine in India and other developing countries, and the United Nations estimates are that in these countries total food supplies will have to increase by 103 percent by 1980 and by 261 percent by the end of the century to maintain even a minimum standard of nutrition.

President Johnson's food message this week combined a new sense of urgency and realism about his problem. He knows that peace and starvation do not go well together, but he is also emphasizing that this staggering problem cannot be met for long by the surpluses of the advanced nations but must be faced by modern agriculture in the land of the hungry nations.

Therefore, he is proposing expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing, and self-help efforts are underway; increased capital and technical assistance; expanded food production in this country; increased emphasis on high protein foods to combat malnutrition, and provision for

adequate reserves to meet any world emergency.

Aside from the humanitarian aspects, the social and political considerations of this program at home and abroad are likely to be considerable. Even a much larger production of food in the United States will not stop the steady flow of people into the cities, but it may slow it up. Farm income is likely to increase encouraging people to stay on the land and in the small agricultural towns, and if Mr. Jefferson was right about the character of the American farmer and the wickedness of urban societies, this will be all to the good.

Overseas, the most striking advantage of the United States in its competition with the Communist countries is on the land. The Russians have got to the moon but somehow they cannot get out of the hole on the earth. Before the war, the Soviet Union, the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and even continental China were exporters of food; now they are all importers.

The United States is now producing its vast agricultural surpluses with less than 10 percent of its people on the land while the Soviet Union cannot feed itself with over 50 percent of its people on the farm. Yield per acre has increased by 109 percent in North America in the last 25 years; by only 7 percent in Asia; and these are factors in the world agricultural and political revolution that are not likely to be overlooked by the leaders of the new and hungry nations.

THE PARADOX

All this appeals greatly to President Johnson. He has a feeling for the land and the poor—having come from both—that comes through in his food and poverty messages more clearly than any others; and in emphasizing them, both at home and abroad, he is establishing a record that may in the end be the symbol of his administration.

This in a way is one of the tragedies of Vietnam. Sometimes we give the impression that we are determined to save those people from communism if we have to kill them in the process, and the controversy over this gets in the way of the larger interests and nobler concerns of the American people.

Kansas High School Press Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on December 23 it was my high honor to hold a press conference with high school journalism students from the Third Congressional District of Kansas. The conference was sponsored by the Kansas City, Kans., Area Chamber of Commerce. The questions were outstanding and challenging, and I believe it was a most worthwhile experience for all of us. A prize was offered by the Kansas City Kansan to the high school student turning in the best story on the conference, judged by a special committee of experts in the field of journalism. Sandy Stines, of Washington High School, of Bethel, Kans., won first place, and Sharon Wohlford, of Argentine High School, of Kansas City, Kans., won honorable mention. I commend these articles to the Congress as proof that the world of journalism has a rich future, and include them herewith:

Appendix

Tribute to Albert Thomas: A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the flag of our country flies at half-mast today and the hearts of our people are saddened because of the death of ALBERT THOMAS—our colleague—one of the great men of our time.

Permit me to take this means of paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory and to his life of selfless and dedicated service to our country.

We are indeed saddened by the realization that ALBERT THOMAS is gone—never to return to the House—never to be with us again in the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations or in the Congress.

It is my firm conviction that there has never been a greater chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee than ALBERT THOMAS.

He worked long.

He worked hard.

He was dedicated to the Congress—to his district—to his beloved State of Texas—and to this great Nation. America will bear the imprint of the creativity and imagination of ALBERT THOMAS for generations to come as the work he did here continues to unfold in growth and progress. Our children and our children's children will live in a better America because of the foresight and wisdom of ALBERT THOMAS.

His grasp of complex and difficult problems was remarkable and his judgment was sound. He will long be remembered for his vision and initiative in the fields of space and science and technology—and in other areas of growth and progress.

ALBERT THOMAS was one of the first to visualize the importance of space exploration and the technological byproducts that such exploration has developed—and will continue to develop. He was a member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and played a crucial role in the development of atomic energy.

He was a member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and took a consistent and strong position for a powerful defense posture for our country—for great national strength—for an America more powerful than any nation in history.

The unselfish dedication of ALBERT THOMAS to the national interest will echo down the corridors of history as the United States meets the challenges at home and abroad which he anticipated.

It was my great honor to serve with ALBERT THOMAS on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations for some 14 years. I sat at his side and learned great lessons from this great man and this great teacher.

ALBERT THOMAS saw this committee as an instrument of service and progress—an instrument that touched the lives of almost every American through the independent agencies our committee funded. ALBERT THOMAS realized this and it gave him vision and dedication—and a will to create a greater America.

But—in addition to his great record of public service and his devotion to the national interest—ALBERT THOMAS was a warm human being. He had a great capacity for friendship—I was his close friend. Working with him, I came to know him well. He was not only a great man but a good man—a man of concern and compassion.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we are saddened by his passing. We are shocked and shaken by the departure of this wonderful man, good friend, and statesman.

Although ALBERT THOMAS would have wanted the Independent Offices Subcommittee to continue its work, in deference to his memory, hearings were suspended this morning.

This Congress and the Nation mourn the passing of this great man from Texas. I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Thomas, to his two lovely daughters, and to the other members of his family in their bereavement.

Strong Resolve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it took a long while before the Marshall plan was appreciated and it may even be awhile before this administration's plan for southeast Asia is appreciated as fully as it should be.

Commenting on the declaration of Honolulu and our strong resolve to help Vietnam, Columnist David Lawrence said:

The war in Vietnam has turned out to be one of the most unselfish and generous expressions of a nation's purpose which has been witnessed in this century.

He believes that ultimately "the American crusade to secure self-determination for the people of Vietnam will be recognized as a manifestation of a great principle and ideal."

I found this column, with its review

of the purposes of the Honolulu declaration and indeed, the role of the United States in southeast Asia, to be most informative, and I offer it to the Record for insertion:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 11, 1966]

DECLARATION OF HONOLULU: A STRONG RESOLVE ON VIET

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—It looks like a long, grueling war ahead in Vietnam. All the talk about escalation or unlimited bombing or mobilizing a vast army of Americans to fight the war has been superseded by a planned determination to build up steadily the economic and military strength of South Vietnam, even if it takes years and years to do the job.

The chances are that no big battles will be fought and that no spectacular military measures will be taken, but that the United States will continue to exercise an increasing pressure that will eventually drive out the Communist guerrillas.

If on any occasion in the meantime the North Vietnamese Government wishes to talk peace, the United States will be ready. But there will have to be some evidence from the enemy that there is a genuine desire to end the war.

President Johnson's trip to Hawaii was intended to strengthen the morale of the Vietnamese Government and at the same time proclaim to the world America's intention to carry on the fight for the ideals that have been set forth again and again in the past.

The Declaration of Honolulu is significant, not because any new principles are enunciated but because the purposes of the United States are defined in even more resolute terms than before. It says, in part:

"The United States of America is joined with the people and Government of Vietnam to prevent aggression. This is the purpose of the determined effort of the American armed forces now engaged in Vietnam. The United States seeks no bases. It seeks no colonial presence. It seeks to impose no alliance or alignment. It seeks only to prevent aggression, and its pledge to that purpose is firm. It aims simply to help a people and government who are determined to help themselves.

"The United States is pledged to the principles of the self-determination of peoples, and of government by the consent of the governed * * *.

"Just as the United States is pledged to play its full part in the worldwide attack upon hunger, ignorance, and disease, so in Vietnam it will give special support to the work of the people of that country to build even while they fight * * *.

"The purpose of the United States remains a purpose of peace. The U.S. Government and the Government of Vietnam will continue in the future, as they have in the past, to press the quest for a peaceful settlement in every forum."

It is interesting to compare what President Johnson affirmed at Honolulu with what he said in a speech on August 12, 1964, just after Congress had authorized him to use the Armed Forces of the United States in Vietnam. He said at that time:

"For 10 years through the Eisenhower administration, the Kennedy administration,

and this administration, we have had one consistent aim—observance of the 1954 agreements which guaranteed the independence of South Vietnam. That independence has been the consistent target of aggression and terror. For 10 years our response to these attacks has followed a consistent pattern. First, that the South Vietnamese have the basic responsibility for the defense of their own freedom.

"Second, we would engage our strength and our resources to whatever extent needed to help others repel aggression * * *.

"None say we should withdraw from South Vietnam * * *. But the United States cannot and must not and will not turn aside and allow the freedom of a brave people to be handed over to Communist tyranny. This alternative is strategically unwise, we think, and it is morally unthinkable."

Although some Americans may think there is a magic way to bring the Vietnam war to a early end, they will find that, while the policy decided upon now does not call for hasty or impulsive action, it means a steady pressure designed to convince the North Vietnamese Government that its aggression in South Vietnam has to be abandoned.

The war in Vietnam has turned out to be one of the most unselfish and generous expressions of a nation's purpose which has been witnessed in this century. Ultimately, the American crusade to secure self-determination for the people of Vietnam will be recognized as a manifestation of a great principle and ideal. It took a long while for the Marshall plan to be appreciated in the decade after World War II was ended, and it will probably take an equally long time before the disinterested and unselfish service rendered to the people of Vietnam by the United States is truly understood by the world.

Time for Renewed Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during these trying moments when pressure from all sides is upon us to back down from our commitment in Vietnam I found the enclosed San Diego Union editorial of January 31 to be most enlightening and helpful in sustaining our convictions. It is entitled "Marine Sounds the Call—Time for Renewed Dedication," and was based on the brief comments made by a most able Marine in the Pacific Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak.

Under unanimous consent, I include this as a portion of my remarks:

MARINE SOUNDS THE CALL—TIME FOR RENEWED DEDICATION

It took only a few short sentences, but Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, commander of the Pacific Fleet Marine Force, answered with firmness and his authority gained over 21 years in the corps just why the United States of America is fighting atheistic communism in South Vietnam.

"If the United States should abandon its commitment to South Vietnam, we will face more Vietnams in Thailand, Cambodia, Malaysia, Australia, and New Zealand," the veteran Marine Corps combat officer declared.

"We are in Vietnam to protect freedom. The freedom of others, which we respect, and our own freedom, which we cherish," General Krulak said, adding there is also a subjective side to our being committed to battle.

"Our own freedom is a direct issue. If we back away now we will tell our friends and enemies that we can't be trusted and we will lose our stake in Asia."

Although General Krulak restricted his remarks to southeast Asia and the present war there, they hold true equally well and also apply to our global commitments to West Germany, Latin America, Japan, and all free nations around the globe to which we are bound either by treaty or moral obligations.

The general left no doubt as to his thoughts on the outcome of the war in Vietnam as he predicted victory for the U.S. forces "because the kids we have over there are doing their job."

Calling for renewed dedication on the part of all Americans, he declared:

"Our young people in Vietnam are doing their job. It has always been the young people of our country who have carried the burden of war * * * [but] the issue is not up to them—it is up to us."

His prediction of victory is based on a belief that the country is coming "more and more to recognize the problem faced in Vietnam."

On draft-card burners, General Krulak recalled how a young wounded marine told him: "They don't count * * * I'll bet they never burned their social security cards or their unemployment checks."

Another boy in a hospital told the general, regarding the college campus demonstrators:

"I don't really mind this within reason. It doesn't amount to much, but I think that any university that would permit signs on its campus which call us butchers doesn't deserve to be called a university."

With the great majority of Americans backing our troops with renewed dedication, the words of the two hospitalized boys gain strength and perhaps even greater purpose than they intended.

"They," indeed, "don't count."

Grain Research Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Topeka, Kans., Daily Capital points out an instance where the new budget may be "penny wise and pound foolish." This is in reference to the proposed cuts in Federal research funds. Kansas State University and other land-grant colleges and universities will be seriously hampered in carrying out vital research if these funds are cut back. The timing is especially bad because the cuts are proposed at a time when we are talking about solving world food problems.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I am sure they will find the words of Dr. Glenn Beck, quoted in the editorial, worthy of note as he exposes the inconsistency in these recommendations. The editorial follows: [From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, Feb. 4, 1966]

GRAIN RESEARCH VITAL

There was bad news on the Kansas farm front this week as Dr. Glenn H. Beck, vice president for agriculture at Kansas State University, told the annual Agricultural Ex-

periment Station Conference at Manhattan that Kansas stands to lose \$222,352 in Federal research funds effective July 1 this year.

If President Johnson's proposed budget is adopted, said Dr. Beck, \$122,000 would be unavailable for studies dealing with wheat and sorghum. The remainder of the slash would affect the Kansas Agriculture Experiment Station and the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service.

The proposed reduction, Dr. Beck contended, is not realistic for obvious reasons.

"Much of this reduction is directed toward studies dealing with wheat and sorghum," he said. "This comes at a time when two-thirds of the countries in the world face disastrous famine. And, paradoxically, it comes at a time when it is our proclaimed policy to extend our help in trying to solve the world food problem."

Similar reductions, he said, have not been made in research on such commodities as tobacco, cotton, and peanuts.

As the No. 1 producer of wheat among the States, Kansas raised 250 million bushels of grain in 1965 worth \$350 million. But the State must depend on quality as well as quantity, said Dr. Beck, and loss of Federal research support will be costly in that it will hinder wheat quality programs.

Pest control research may also be cut back to the extent that it would mean crop losses equivalent to \$25 to \$50 million annually.

"Harvest sorghum grain, alone, has a cash value of at least \$135 million," Dr. Beck pointed out. "More important, it serves as a principal source of energy needed to produce meat animals worth a half billion dollars."

Dr. Beck's objections to the proposed cutbacks in Federal support are based on sound reasoning. With a huge food-producing task ahead, Kansas farmers will need to keep up the continual improvement of quality and production methods as they have in the past.

Now is the time for all good Kansans to take time to write to their congressional delegation. It's hard to believe that the administration wants to take steps to lessen food production when our grain reserves continue to dwindle and the demand is increasing.

Washington promises other nations that help in the way of food is coming. It doesn't make sense to cancel productive programs. In the light of appropriations these days, the amount involved is relatively small for the benefits it will bring. Surely our representatives in Congress will do their best to maintain present research programs.

Our New War—Anti-Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1966, the Los Angeles Times contained an outstanding editorial on the problem of inflation.

It very properly and forcefully points out that to check inflationary tendencies requires not only restraint by labor and management, but by the Federal Government itself. As inflation, which has frequently been defined as a hidden tax, affects all of our people, I recommend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

February 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A741

Obviously, if the seaway is to be as successful as these proponents say it will be, then there should be no need for lowering tolls nor even maintaining them at the present level. Instead, they should be raised to more fully repay the American taxpayer for his investment in this waterway system. However, more specific evidence of why seaway tolls should be brought into a more realistic level will be submitted by this committee at such time as it is called before proper bodies to present its opinion on the seaway toll structure.

At this time, the committee wishes to state that it feels the upcoming review of seaway revenues and tariffs to be of vital importance to the whole Nation, and that it should be conducted in public; and that every segment of transportation, shipping, port, and civic interests be given the opportunity to appear before the appropriate bodies.

The actions of the Federal Government in attempting to divert cargo, through promotion and other means, to the seaway away from ports which are more self-reliant and which have historically done their own port promotion and developing, is shocking. The committee feels that more should be said on this subject, and that definite guidelines should be established to make certain that the Government does not unfairly use its resources to promote seaway ports to the disadvantage of other ports in the United States with whom the seaway competes.

At this time, the committee prefers to call attention to the requirement that the toll program of the seaway be reviewed and recommendations made by July 1, 1966, and to ask that this review be made part of a public dialog considering the tremendous investment the taxpayers of this country have made in the St. Lawrence Seaway, and the potential impact of further tax subsidy upon the non-federally-supported ports in the North, South Atlantic, and gulf.

National Eye Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to introduce a companion bill to one introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRED B. ROONEY, to establish a National Eye Institute as part of the National Institutes of Health.

It is time for us to wake up to the tragic waste in human resources that takes its toll each year in eye diseases.

With over 11 million people in the United States either partially or totally blind, we need to face this problem with more than a hope of better days.

In Iowa we have one of the finest programs for rehabilitation of the blind in the entire country. Under the excep-

tional direction of Mr. Kenneth Jernigan, this program has been able to revitalize lives that were doomed to despair and discouragement. Along with this rehabilitation work, the fine Lions Club eye bank project has restored sight to a number of fortunate individuals.

It does not in any way detract from the excellent work of these organizations to say that we are failing in our efforts. We fail, because so little is known, and the problems are multiplying faster than we can provide answers. In 1963, the cost of caring for those already blind amounted to more than \$1 billion. At the same time, public and private sources spent only \$9 million on research. It is easy to see that much work is needed in this area.

With more than 80 percent of all loss of vision in our Nation due to diseases whose causes are unknown to science, we have an urgent responsibility to press forward in this area.

The emotional, psychological, and physical disturbances that arise from blindness are well known. We now have to bring the poser of our scientific age to bear upon this major health problem.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, so that the fear that stalks our land in the form of blindness may be put aside.

Hon. Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Director Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, I request unanimous consent that a tribute to the memory of the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, our beloved colleague, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The tribute, in the form of a letter, follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1966.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: In common with all who knew him, we at the National Science Foundation are saddened today to learn of the passing of ALBERT THOMAS. His loss will be felt deeply by the scientific community and by the people of the United States for whom he worked so devotedly.

I personally came to know, admire, and respect Mr. THOMAS as a great public servant and as a warm and considerate personality through my relations with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which he was a member, and later with the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which he chaired. He demanded the highest standards of public servants, while meeting these standards himself in every way. He was rigorous in his demands, but he was always fair, and he was always receptive to new ideas that might make the Government more responsive to the needs of the people it serves.

The high esteem in which he was held by the Foundation is attested to by the fact that upon the 15th anniversary of the Foundation and the 100th meeting of the National Science Board last May, the Board presented him with a certificate in grateful acknowledgment of the indebtedness of the Foundation and the American people to him for his vision and his help in making the Foundation a more effective instrument to serve the national purpose.

Today we honor his memory. His State, his Nation, and his countrymen are the better for his great accomplishments on their behalf.

Sincerely,

LELAND J. HAWORTH,
Director.

Marine Fighting for All of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Union recently ran a most enlightening letter to the editor from Marine Corps Sgt. Jimmie L. Harris in Vietnam. Sergeant Harris is a native of San Diego and his feelings about the "get out of Vietnam" demonstrations are set forth in clear language that every American can easily comprehend.

Under unanimous consent I include this as a portion of my remarks:

READERS' VIEWPOINT: MARINE FIGHTING FOR ALL OF US

EDITOR, THE UNION:

I am a Marine sergeant presently stationed in Vietnam, and a native of San Diego. It has been several years since I have lived there. However, my parents, Mr. and Mrs. T. P. Callas, live at 1610 Union Street.

I receive the San Diego Union here and I continue to read of the many "Get out of Vietnam" and anti-U.S. policy demonstrations.

I cannot understand how, supposedly, mature, and educated people can so openly defy a decision made by our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

A decision was made by our Government to help the determined South Vietnamese people to win their war against a Communist aggressor so they may have a government of their own choosing.

Have the demonstrators ever stopped to realize the damaging amount of fuel they are giving to the Communist regime to be used as propaganda against us? We here in Vietnam are having enough problems fighting a very effective enemy without our own people's adding to them.

I, for one, wish it was possible to get these individuals over here to see the agony, hurt, heartaches, and grief that is suffered every day so that they may continue to enjoy the freedom and rights they now exercise. We are paying a very high price here to stop Communist aggression so we will not have to fight our next battle on our own soil.

I am aware that this is but a small minority group demonstrating and tearing up draft cards. However, this minority is being heard loudly all over the world. My personal opinion is that they are cowards and they do not have enough guts to stand up and protect their rights. I only hope I will never come into direct contact with these demonstrators or see them wave Vietcong

flags, because I will be, with much pleasure, facing charges of assault and battery.

We have received so very many packages and cards from American citizens, unknown to us, who are behind us all of the way. These are the true Americans who should be heard above all others and commended for their interest and support for an unknown serviceman in a war so very many miles from home.

I am an American fighting man serving my country the best I know how and I am proud of being here doing what I know must be done. I have a wonderful wife and three lovely children that I love and miss very much. However, I am willing to live in mud, dust, a foxhole, tent, rain, and heat so they may continue to be safe and warm in the land of the free.

Sgt. JIMMIE L. HARRIS, USMC.

Great American Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the Dubuque, Iowa, Country Club, on the occasion of the dedication of the new Coca-Cola bottling plant in Dubuque on February 3, 1966. I am also including an interesting editorial from the New York Daily News of February 4, 1966, and an article from the Des Moines Register of the same date:

GREAT AMERICAN PRESIDENTS

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the dinner on the occasion of the dedication of the new Coca-Cola bottling plant, Dubuque, Iowa, February 3, 1966, Dubuque Country Club)

I am not one to contradict Shakespeare but I think I can prove that comparisons are not always odious. I take nothing away from President Andrew Jackson when I say that Franklin D. Roosevelt was a great President; and I take nothing away from Presidents Jackson or Franklin D. Roosevelt or Truman when I say that President Lyndon B. Johnson has already proven that he is of the same mold.

I am mindful that these Presidents all were Democrats. It is not, however, why I picked them, though I am willing to concede that being Democrats didn't count against them either.

All four Presidents measured their problems with only one yardstick: "What's best for the American people" and, that answered, they immediately activated their decisions. President Jackson urged low interest rates for the common people—so does President Johnson. President Jackson was understanding, as President Johnson is, of the fact that the inflationary fears of the financial market aren't nearly as close to the common people as the deflationary fears of unemployment and farm foreclosure.

When I first came to Iowa, 35 years ago, in the depths of the depression, a farmer couldn't buy a package of cigarettes for a bushel of corn. The farm country was at the point of rebellion. Armed farmers prevented foreclosures; and when the legislature met they sustained the farmers.

Franklin D. Roosevelt wanted neither foreclosures nor rebellion. What he wanted was a New Deal for all and he got it in the form of 100 basic pieces of legislation passed in 100 days—a feat unparalleled in American history until President Johnson's programs were enacted by the 89th Congress. Of those 100 basic acts of Congress, as the late great Speaker Sam Rayburn pointed out, none have been repealed, all have been expanded and all are now part of the platforms of both major parties.

And, of course, the same thing will be true of the Great Society measures which President Johnson is now enacting into law. I predict that in another 35 years from now the Great Society will be flourishing, and further the principal question will not be why it was enacted by President Johnson but why it was delayed until he alone had to accomplish it.

I understand that these are expansive declarations but I am prepared to prove them.

President Lyndon Johnson is the direct spiritual heir of a number of the great American Presidents. The first is President Jefferson. President Johnson has done something more than merely adopt President Jefferson's theory of government. He has elaborated it into the most effective method of party responsibility in the history of our country.

It annoys me, to be frank, to see his consummate skill criticized as that of mere clever manipulation. Actually, it represents a new and fundamental approach.

More particularly, President Jefferson insisted that the party assume full responsibility before the American people. In order to give the American people an honest choice of its policies President Jefferson believed that the congressional leadership and the Chief Executive should be in constant conference before the legislation was offered. President Jefferson himself attended such caucuses and when he could not go he sent Albert Gallatin, his Secretary of the Treasury.

President Johnson has furthered the same system. Had Presidents Jackson, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt employed the Johnson-Jefferson approach they would have saved the country many a crisis, and would have avoided many headaches for themselves in their wars with Capitol Hill.

Franklin D. Roosevelt did employ this method for his first term. There was complete party responsibility and there was complete cooperation on Capitol Hill.

As President Jefferson employed Albert Gallatin to maintain such liaison, the President delegated that duty to me as Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Vice President Garner, Senators Joseph T. Robinson, Pat Harrison, and James T. Byrnes, and Congressmen Henry Rainey, Joseph Byrne, and Sam Rayburn, certainly as astute as any men who trod Capitol Hill, were prime factors in moving that massive legislation to completion. It was the Jefferson pattern in full and effective sway. Everyone who is familiar with what has happened in the Congress for over 30 years knows full well that President Johnson was a protégé of Speaker Sam Rayburn. Every bit of legislative know-how he possessed was made known to the young Congressman, and I think it is fair to say that the pupil has at least equaled the master now.

President Roosevelt was prevailed upon by a certain group to abandon this procedure and the disastrous policy of attacking the Supreme Court was embarked upon, even as the congressional liaison was abandoned. In fact, the Congress was not even consulted before the plan was made public—and neither was I. The result was a paralysis of Government for a full year. President Johnson would never have made this mistake.

Unfortunately, those who did not believe in the Jefferson approach lost more by their

bad manners than they could possibly have gained for the country by their good policies.

The New Deal bogged down, not because its aims were less exalted but because its bright young men had no concept of working with the Congress. President Johnson makes no such mistakes. He assumes that election to public office carries a presumption that the officeholder is also a gentleman. His unexampled good manners with the Congress have resulted in unexampled good legislation for the country. The net effect is that the country is more united under President Lyndon B. Johnson than any time since the era of good feeling under President Monroe. But it annoys me, I repeat, to see a great constitutional function initiated by the most effective President in American history with the Congress and have it passed off, or even criticized, as mere political cleverness. So much for that; President Johnson has placed the Government nearer the people and the Congress than any man since Jefferson. If continued, it will result in orderly, democratic government without the paralysis of a continued duel between Capitol Hill and the White House, for generations to come. Therefore, in this alone President Johnson is, in my opinion, the greatest constitutionalist of the American Presidents.

And now let us examine the Great Society. President Jefferson was bitterly criticized for paying \$15 million—\$15 million, not billion—for all of the territory between New Orleans and Montana. On it now stand dozens of cities where one city block is worth more than that.

Secretary Seward was called a fool for paying some \$7½ million for Alaska. The fish catch alone now exceeds the purchase price every single year.

Yet there are those who do not see that President Johnson has discovered a whole new country—1,200 miles long and 250 miles wide, within our own country. I mean Appalachia, and I predict that this Johnsonland will blossom forth with vast new cities on the western slopes of the Alleghenies in the next century as the eastern slopes of the Rockies brought forth their great cities in the last.

There are those who deride but there are those who decide. I can only say that one of the gateways to Appalachia, Atlanta, is leading the country in expansion. Atlanta will be to Appalachia what St. Louis is to the Missouri Valley. Mail volume alone went up even 25 percent last year.

Private industry has glimpsed the vision of President Johnson—and is translating it into reality. Therefore, I count the opening of Appalachia on a par with Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase. Accordingly, what has been sneered at as a poverty program will develop by the year 2000 into one of the country's great assets. And for this, too, history will call President Johnson great.

Now let me again remind you, if I may, of my first visit to Iowa in 1931. Millions and millions of people were out of work. In that terrible hour it is my proud statement that President Franklin D. Roosevelt rescued the country from civil disorder and even rebellion. He saved the farms, the banks, the insurance companies, our industrial empire and he saved the homes of the people. And he did it in the pattern of President Andrew Jackson—and in the pattern now being elaborated by President Johnson. I can state it in one sentence. The Federal Reserve, pursuant to its duty is charged with guarding the currency from inflation; but President Lyndon B. Johnson, by a much higher order of oath, is charged with guarding the American people from the infinitely greater disaster of deflation. I can understand the alarm of a financial community which fears we are expanding too fast. But, again, I can more readily sympathize with a President who is determined that the expanding economy shall not contract at all.

Farley said his robust health was because "I lead a busy and disciplined life."

Farley, in Dubuque to dedicate a new bottling plant for the Coca-Cola Bottling Co. here, is now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

He said he tries to be in bed at 11:30 p.m. 5 nights each week and sleeps well "unless I eat unwisely." He indicated that some banquet meals were among the unwise meals.

He also said that he was "blessed with a good constitution due to my rugged forebears," and he watches his diet.

He also commented on:

President Johnson: "The best qualified man ever nominated in the history of the Democratic Party."

The national economy: "Steadily increasing, good during the last 5 years."

Vietnam: "The President has no real option. The option lies with the Communists, the aggressors."

Civil rights: "The solution to the problems of the Negroes and Puerto Ricans is education for them."

Successor to President Johnson: "HUBERT HUMPHREY. He would make a great president."

The war on poverty: "Will develop by the year 2000 as one of the Nation's greatest assets."

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to note the passing of a beloved colleague. Too often the stalwarts of the Congress, who have written so much of the history of their times, are suddenly gone from the scene. In awe of God's inscrutable ways we meet today to register our sincere thoughts of ALBERT THOMAS, what he meant and how we will miss him.

To know ALBERT was to love and respect him. During the years he so ably served the Eighth Congressional District of Texas, I learned to appreciate what a fine, outstanding job he did in carrying out his responsibilities to his people. Loved and respected for his fairness, sound judgment, deep courage and devotion to America, his rare capacity for leadership will be sorely missed in the years to come.

He was quiet and soft spoken, and as he went about his daily tasks, he had a kind greeting for everyone.

In thinking of ALBERT, I am reminded of the words penned by the late Sir William Osler, the noted Canadian physician:

I have three personal ideals. One, to do the day's work well and not to bother about tomorrow. The second ideal has been to act the Golden Rule, as far as in me lay, toward my professional brethren and toward those committed to my care. And the third has been to cultivate such a measure of equanimity as would enable me to bear success with humility, the affection of my friends without pride, and to be ready when the day of sorrow and grief came to meet it with the courage befitting a man.

ALBERT THOMAS fully measured up to such ideals. We shall miss him, but he has left forever with us countless memories of a wonderful person.

Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the February 5, 1966, issue of the New York Times contained an interesting article on Woodrow Wilson by Author-Journalist James T. Farrell, and in reading this editorial, I felt that others will also want to see the appraisal made by this writer, and with this in mind, I would commend this article to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. It follows:

TOPICS: WOODROW WILSON REMEMBERED

(By James T. Farrell)

Forty-two years ago this week Woodrow Wilson died at his house in Washington. He had always liked Thomas Gray's "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard." When "the paths of glory" led him to his "inevitable hour," Wilson is supposed to have said to his wife:

"Edith, I'm a broken machine, but I'm ready."

As I look back, I can summon from my imagination and memory and from my reading several different images of this man who became President when I was 9 years old, and a War President when I was 13, and who, when I was 14, was the Hero of the World, as though he were a savior of mankind, and then lost and crumbled. Repudiated politically, paralyzed physically, he left office at the end of his second term, and the exponent of "normalcy" succeeded him.

FOCUS OF TRAGEDY

When I was passing through adolescence and young manhood in the 1920's, Wilson then seemed to me to focus the tragedy of the world into which my contemporaries and I were growing up. With the years, he becomes one of the many characters of that tragedy, not the sole protagonist. I cannot think of him with sadness.

Even in my first hot moments of postwar disillusionment, with the anger of a young man's feeling of betrayal, and the expectation that my generation and I, myself, would pay the price of Wilson's historic failure as a peacemaker at Versailles, I did not lose my underlying sense of sadness. For it was not the failure of a man, but of human hope for a better and much different kind of world, which imbues the story of Wilson with the somber tones of tragedy.

A BOY'S TRUST

But those were not my first impressions of Wilson. As an Irish boy in Chicago I grew up thinking that he was a great man, the greatest President since Abraham Lincoln. My father had voted for him. He was brainy, a scholar; he had a big vocabulary. I was a trusting boy. My trust extended to the President, and I wanted him to do right and to be right.

With the succession of days from 1914 to 1917, the First World War slowly penetrated my consciousness, as it did that of most Americans. The war meant death and suffering, the death of countless thousands; it meant soldiers going over the top on bayonet charges and being mowed down by machine-guns. But President Wilson knew what to do. I didn't even have to tell myself such a thought; I knew it and believed it as I believed that the sun would shine in the morning that must follow the night. President Wilson was a hero of mine.

Wilson at one point early in the war proclaimed that the United States was "too

proud to fight." I later perceived that this famous statement reflected one of Wilson's outstanding traits. He was a phrasemaker who, too frequently, substituted words for the deeds of decision. Such a statement was a phrasemaker's remark. Americans have never to my knowledge been "too proud to fight," but they were reluctant to fight at that time because they didn't quite know what the fighting was all about.

Wilson understood intellectually that the Presidency is, first of all, a place where power has to be exercised and action taken. As he said shortly after his election in 1912: "This is an office in which a man must put on his war paint. Fortunately, I am not of such a visage as to mind marring it."

But Wilson, a minister's son, a scholar, and a man of words, who came to the practice of politics late in his career, was not by nature at ease with himself when he had his "war paint" on. H. L. Mencken described him as "the perfect model of the Christian cad." That was once a fashionable judgment which I largely shared, though I never wholly lost my compassion for him. At times, Wilson may have acted in a way that justified Mencken's description.

At the climax of his life, however, Wilson died bravely for his conduct, his actions, his signature. Beaten, with the people turning against him, he went out to face them to try to persuade them. Self-deluded as he was at Versailles and as J. M. Keynes so graphically described for us in "The Economic Consequences of the Peace," Wilson faced the people in defense of his conduct. Vanity, in part, appears to have been a source of his courage; but how many of the vain have courage?

His conduct suggests that if his health had not failed he would have convinced the people or would have walked in loneliness to his grave. "For nothing less depends upon this decision (whether or not to ratify his signing of the Versailles Treaty), nothing less than the liberation of the world, * * * he declared.

DEATH OF AN IDEAL

But when Wilson became no more, the hopes which he had lifted out of the mud and blood and agony into a dreamlike euphoria of faith—those hopes had died. He had outlived his oratorical idealism.

Our world, our tragic century, had truly begun.

Support Given

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's policy in South Vietnam has the firm support of the Denver Post, which asserts that the President has asked for—"and deserves to get—the support of the American people in his broad-based program for South Vietnam."

In a February 10 editorial, the Post declared:

The time is late and the opposition of the Communist enemy is great. But the President's goals are, we believe, sincere, and should be given every chance to succeed.

Under unanimous consent, I insert this clearly stated editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

L.B.J. MAINTAINS POSITIVE VIET STANCE

President Johnson has asked for—and deserves to get—the support of the American

February 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7

For those who tell you that you share of the national debt is increasing I strongly urge that you ask if your share of the national assets is increasing more rapidly to say nothing of your share of the national income. You will find that the American Republic is so overwhelmingly solvent that any talk of the American dollar being unsound is pure nonsense. As a matter of fact, it is not told which is holding up the value of the dollar. It is the value of the dollar which is holding up the gold standard. President Johnson is perfectly aware that the American dollar is backed by the greatest production machine, the most skilled labor force, and the most advanced scientific groups in the history of man. To keep this combination in the forefront he has brought every possible assistance at the command of the Presidency.

There are many facets to the expanding Great Society that it is impossible to even begin to enumerate, must less to treat each one. But, at random, let us consider the case of the aged. When Franklin D. Roosevelt first promulgated social security it started more than a great debate. It started the great abuse. It was declared that the President was undermining the American character. It was further stated that he slandered the ability of the average American to take care of himself in his old age. But we called upon the actual statistics. They proved that 90 percent of all American workers over 60 were dependent upon their relatives for support. When I was a boy, many married children could not support their parents and they had to go to the Alms House, in my home county called the poorhouse.

In the face of the most unfair kind of attacks, I take pride in the fact that under President Franklin D. Roosevelt I helped guide the legislation which not only wiped the Alms House off the map but blasted the undignified word of poorhouse out of the language.

And now, President Johnson has gone far beyond even our hopes of those days. He will pilot through legislation which will put two schools in every place where there used to be a poorhouse and by doing so he will triple the already huge assets of the Nation. And, I am not talking in the abstract. I am talking in the concrete. In the first place, our expansion as a country cannot continue without an expanding school system. In the second place, for every dollar invested in the education of the young \$25 will be returned to the young citizen in increased earnings. The taxes he will pay as an educated man will return at least 110 percent to the Government itself as an investment.

So the issue of whether or not we can afford the Great Society is not only spurious but idiotic. The fact is that we cannot afford not to follow the President forward. In 1933, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt brought the country out of a depression because he banked on the great character of the American people in the past. President Johnson, in these happier times, is leading the American people to new heights by banking on that same American character in the future. To him will come one of the greatest satisfactions known to man. Thomas Jefferson thought so much of his contribution in this field that he omitted mentioning that he was President of the United States, but mentioned that he was founder of the University of Virginia in his will. President Johnson's Great Society has as its cornerstone the founding of a great many schools and colleges to give every American child a chance to develop his talent. Once a political party in this country could stand for election on a platform merely of a full dinner pail. Then it advanced to a chicken in every pot. Then a car in every garage.

Now President Johnson has abandoned this material approach. He stands on a platform

of an education for every child and the necessary books and schools and scholarships to develop its talents. In my opinion, as Thomas Jefferson wrote the Bill of Rights for all American men and women President Lyndon B. Johnson has written a bill of rights for every American child. And for this alone he will go down as one of the greatest of Presidents. Thus, Thomas Jefferson's greatest monument, in his own opinion, was his name on the cornerstone of the University of Virginia. Hence, President Johnson's greatest monument will be his name in the hundreds of schools and colleges and universities he is already founding.

I am proud of the fact that I knew him when he was a yearling—when only the eyes of Texas were upon him. But I have seen him grow until the eyes of the Nation were upon him as majority leader—and no man was more wholeheartedly dedicated to the Nation than Democratic Majority Leader Johnson when he supported Republican President Eisenhower during the Berlin crisis. Ex-President Eisenhower could testify to that. I urge that President Lyndon B. Johnson is entitled to the same support as President that he gave as majority leader.

For some time there has been much controversy pro and con on the situation in Vietnam. The President has no real option in Vietnam. The real option rests with the Communists, for they are the aggressors and have been since 1945. For a month now, the President has sought some sort of an accommodation by which killing would stop. Since the Reds have not responded it must be assumed that they wish to continue the war.

But Vietnam is not an isolated spot. It is merely the one on which the Communists are exerting full pressure at this time. As Al Smith said, "Let's look at the record."

The Communists first succeeded in getting a coalition government in China. They were then given the Japanese war arsenal in Manchuria. With the superior arms they threw out the Nationalists.

When Moscow put Berlin under pressure, Red China seized Korea. When we forced them back to the 38th parallel and they saw they were going to be defeated, only then and then only did they seek an armistice. They prolonged this for months and months—while they moved their forces down to the south. Then they demanded Quemoy and Matsu. When they found we would not yield they conquered Tibet and, incidentally, put thousands and thousands of innocent people to death.

When that was accomplished, they put pressure on Vietnam and threw out the French. When an agreement was reached in 1954, on Vietnam, they at once transferred pressure to Laos. They succeeded in getting a coalition government in Laos, and threw that country into chaos. Now they are using Laos as part of their line of supply to South Vietnam.

Obviously, if we vacated South Vietnam they would continue the pressure throughout southeast Asia.

Thus, President Johnson did not adopt a war policy. He had war thrust upon him. Our position in South Vietnam is not like a Normandy beachhead. It is more like a Dunkirk. The President is in the same position as Winston Churchill in 1940. He is a receiver in bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement. Appeasement has brought our affairs in Asia to this sad state. Continued appeasement will not only lose Vietnam, it will lose us our Asiatic allies and greatly impair our Atlantic Alliance.

The President, like Churchill, can only offer us blood, sweat, and tears; but if we attempt to run away the pressure will increase every time. The fact is that had the policy of the President been adopted in 1946, instead of 1966, there would be peace in the Pacific right now.

Much has been said, and rightly, of the necessity of the United States honoring its commitment to its allies. I go one step further. Thirty-one thousand Americans died and one hundred thousand were wounded in Korea. We would shame ourselves and belie their sacrifice if we gave away in the jungles of Vietnam what they died for in the snows of Korea.

The great tragedy is that the Communists always mistake humanity for weakness. The strong effort the President has been making for peace has been derided by them as his fear of American public opinion. Nothing could be further from the truth. He has done all that he could and the American public knows it. Accordingly, when hostilities resume on a full scale every American will know without being told exactly what President Roosevelt reported to the Nation on Pearl Harbor Day: "They asked for it."

I am sure the American people approve the position taken by President Johnson in his statement to the Nation on Monday of the resumption of all activities in North Vietnam. The reason for his course of action was explained in greater detail by Secretary of State Dean Rusk immediately afterward at a press conference. This should settle any prolonged debate and we should back the President to a man in the position he has taken which in his judgment is in the best interests of our country and the free world as well.

As President of the United States the eyes of not only the Nation but of the world are on Lyndon B. Johnson. And if the Biblical phrase "By their fruits ye know them" continues to be as true in the future as it has been in the past the future generations of our country will as gratefully remember President Lyndon Baines Johnson as they now revere the names of Thomas Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman. I think a man has seen much if he once sees greatness in his lifetime. I congratulate myself that I have seen it four times—in Presidents Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Truman. And, make no mistake, Lyndon Baines Johnson is destined to be one of the greatest Presidents in American history.

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 4, 1966]
GUEST EDITORIAL BY FORMER POSTMASTER GENERAL JAMES A. FARLEY, SPEAKING THURSDAY AT A BIG COCA-COLA DO IN DUBUQUE, IOWA

President Johnson did not adopt a war policy. He had war thrust upon him. Our position in South Vietnam is not like a Normandy beachhead. It is more like a Dunkirk. The President is in the same position as Winston Churchill in 1940. He is a receiver in bankruptcy of the policy of appeasement. Appeasement has brought our affairs in Asia to this sad state. Continued appeasement will not only lose Vietnam, it will lose us our Asiatic allies and greatly impair our Atlantic Alliance.

The President, like Churchill, can only offer us blood, sweat, and tears; but if we attempt to run away the pressure will increase every time. The fact is that had the policy of the President been adopted in 1946, instead of 1966, there would be peace in the Pacific right now.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Feb. 4, 1966]

WISE EATING TIED TO HEALTH

DUBUQUE, IOWA.—A 77-year-old former U.S. Postmaster General told 20 persons at a press conference at Loras College Thursday that the way he stayed in good health was pushing himself away from the dinner table.

James A. Farley served as national Democratic chairman before he was appointed Postmaster General by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

February 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

people in his broad-based program for South Vietnam. The time is late and the opposition of the Communist enemy is great. But the President's goals are, we believe, sincere and should be given every chance to succeed.

In seeking strength to carry on the war, joined by a renewed effort to build social and economic progress into South Vietnamese institutions, the President admittedly is undertaking a monumental task.

Our enemy in Vietnam, the Vietcong, hold only about 25 percent of the country. Nevertheless, Vietcong units are capable of striking widely to destroy peaceful programs instituted by United States and Saigon forces.

This has happened repeatedly. It will happen again. To overcome such a pattern will require tremendous effort and manpower.

Such a policy, however, is the price of standing firm in Vietnam.

The President's new stance already is being vilified by many prominent Americans who see the Declaration of Honolulu either as a crude attempt to justify a "wrong" war or as a prelude to vast escalation of American fighting power in Vietnam.

Discussion is fine but all too often the President is attacked by people who shoot from the hip. Among the criticisms: "the war is going badly; let's get out while we can." Or: "we shouldn't have gone there in the first place."

The validity of such statements must be measured against the broader issues of this Nation's commitments, not simply in South Vietnam but in Thailand and elsewhere.

There is criticism from other people who refuse to believe the statement of the enemy.

The search for peace must be maintained. But this should not include calling the President deaf every time a new rumor floats from Hanoi. Here is what Hanoi has said about peace (and we think it is the current view): "The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled in accordance with the program" of the Vietcong.

Such a statement leaves little room for American initiative in mediation. We cannot surrender hundreds of thousands of loyal Vietnamese to the whims of the Vietcong. Nor can we agree to the implicit view of Hanoi: that the Vietcong is the "legal" government of South Vietnam.

Given the benefit of hindsight, many Americans would not choose involvement in a war such as that which exists in South Vietnam. To other Americans, it is a war in which—once committed—we should have have made our force felt in overwhelming fashion.

But the confrontation for President Johnson is that which exists today. We think the announcements following his meeting in Honolulu with South Vietnamese leaders indicate he is seeking to salvage more than honor from this war.

He is seeking positive things: helping an embattled ally militarily and, at the same time, trying to advance the social reforms which South Vietnam needs for survival. The President's critics should keep those things in mind in their search for answers that are, admittedly, difficult.

Message From the Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, in another example of his excellent service to the public, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has discussed the attempt by the Com-

munist Party to gain new inroads through working on college campuses.

Writing in the February 1966 issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Director Hoover states that the college student of today is being subjected to a "bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth."

He says that the Communist cause is being promoted primarily through a two-pronged offensive, a college speaking program and campus-oriented Communist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks I submit Mr. Hoover's article for inclusion in the Record:

MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

The American college student today is being subjected to a bewildering and dangerous conspiracy perhaps unlike any social challenge ever before encountered by our youth. On many campuses he faces a turbulence built on unrestrained individualism, repulsive dress and speech, outright obscenity, disdain for moral and spiritual values, and disrespect for law and order. This movement, commonly referred to as the "new left," is complex in its deceitful absurdity and characterized by its lack of commonsense.

Fortunately, a high percentage of the more than 3 million full-time college students are dedicated, hardworking, and serious-minded young people; however, their good deeds and achievements are greatly overshadowed by those who are doing a tremendous amount of talking but very little thinking.

Much of this turmoil has been connected with a feigned concern for the vital rights of free speech, dissent, and petition. Hardcore fanatics have used these basic rights of our democratic society to distort the issues and betray the public. However, millions of Americans, who know from experience that freedom and rights also mean duties and responsibilities, are becoming alarmed over the anarchistic and seditious ring of these campus disturbances. They know liberty and justice are not possible without law and order.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., as well as other subversive groups, is jubilant over these new rebellious activities. The unvarnished truth is that the Communist conspiracy is seizing this insurrectionary climate to captivate the thinking of rebellious-minded youth and coax them into the Communist movement itself or at least agitate them into serving the Communist cause. This is being accomplished primarily by a two-pronged offensive—a much-publicized college speaking program and the campus-oriented Communist W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. Therefore, the Communist influence is cleverly injected into civil disobedience and reprisals against our economic, political, and social system.

There are those who scoff at the significance of these student flareups, but let us make no mistake: the Communist Party does not consider them insignificant. The participants of the new left are part of the 100,000 "state-of-mind" members Gus Hall, the party's general secretary, refers to when he talks of party strength. He recently stated the party is experiencing the greatest upsurge in its history with a "one to two thousand" increase in membership in the last year.

For the first time since 1959, the party plans a national convention this spring. We can be sure that high on the agenda will be strategy and plans to win the new left and other new members. A Communist student, writing in an official party organ, recently stated, "There is no question but that the new left will be won."

Thus, the Communists' intentions are

abundantly clear. We have already seen the effects of some of their stepped-up activities, and I firmly believe a vast majority of the American public is disgusted and sickened by such social orgies. One recourse is to support and encourage the millions of youth who refuse to swallow the Communist bait. Another is to let it be known far and wide that we do not intend to stand idly by and let demagogues make a mockery of our laws and demolish the foundation of our Republic.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,

Director.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Reforms Proposed for Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed major reforms in the foreign aid program. The new program is directed toward those countries ready and willing to help themselves.

The New Orleans Times-Picayune commented on these proposals in a very timely and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Reforms Proposed for Foreign Aid." The editorial pointed out that emphasis "will be placed on self-help projects in education, health, agriculture, and population control designed to assist underdeveloped nations in developing the human resources upon which economic development depends."

Because the editorial is timely, I have permission to include it in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REFORMS PROPOSED FOR FOREIGN AID

A bold step toward bringing order and efficiency to the foreign aid program, proposed in the Senate last year and then killed, has been urged again by President Johnson in the foreign aid bill for 1967 presented to the Congress this week.

In essence, what the President has proposed is a 5-year authorization (instead of 1 year) to enable long-range planning of major projects, principally in the areas of education, health, and agriculture where quick solutions to age-old problems are simply not possible. The President also has advocated the separation of economic and military assistance, as advocated last year by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas. This may complicate the task of moving the bill through Congress, but it should also explain the philosophy and policy goals underlying the massive assistance programs.

The administration's conviction in the wisdom of these reforms is indicated by the reduced money request: \$3.38 billion was asked for 1967, \$236 million less than for the current year, in the belief that lower prices, transportation costs, and other efficiencies will actually increase the volume of commodities to be shipped abroad.

Opposition to similar reforms last year centered in the House of Representatives and in maverick corners of the Senate, most notably in Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. A Senate amendment embracing a 2-year authorization, separation of military and economic aid, and a commission to recommend policy goals was discarded in the House-Senate conference committee, but with stipulations that the proposals would again be considered this year.

Basis for the opposition is an understandable reluctance in Congress to relinquish annual review of foreign aid operations.

However, the shifting focus of foreign aid, outlined by Mr. Johnson, seems to minimize these objections. Emphasis under the programs proposed will be placed on self-help projects in education, health, agriculture, and population control designed to assist underdeveloped nations in developing the human resources upon which economic development depends.

These are undertakings that cannot be planned year by year, and, if successful, promise significant foreign policy gains for the United States. Congress, furthermore, will still have an opportunity for annual review of the program before making the final appropriations.

Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce Commends Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, throughout America, there has been a great deal of concern and discussion over the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. The recently concluded debate in the Senate was, I believe, indicative of the widespread public concern over this issue.

I recently noted a news release put out by the Fairfax Chamber of Commerce, of Fairfax, Va., commending Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., for his stand in opposition to the proposed repeal. Senator BYRD, who has served in the Senate just a short time, has strongly favored our State right-to-work laws and has effectively presented his views in this connection. Having served in the State Senate of Virginia for 18 years and having a wide background both in public life and in business, he is most familiar with this overall issue.

It is my pleasure to have the text of the news release published by the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce and the accompanying resolution printed at this place in the RECORD.

FAIRFAX COUNTY CHAMBER COMMENDS
SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

"Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JR., was officially commended today by the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, board of directors for his firm stand in support of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act," announced Chamber President R. Brandon Marsh.

"Our directors voted unanimously to congratulate Senator Byrd," said Marsh. "and for the restatement of the Fairfax County Chamber's continued opposition to the repeal of this measure." The following is the official statement of the directors:

"Together with Senator BYRD, the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce unalterably opposes repeal of section 14(b). Members of the chamber admire their Senator's defense of this law which permits States to forbid unions and employers to force a man to join the union or be fired.

"We believed in the rights granted under 14(b), which 19 States exercised to pass laws prohibiting so-called union shop clauses in labor agreements; when the union shop makes union membership a condition of holding a job. We join Senator BYRD in his dedication to the principle that a person

has the right to work with the freedom of choice to join or not to join a labor union.

"We believe the worker's freedom of choice should not be taken away from him and sold to the highest bidder in the market place of the bargaining table.

"Accordingly, the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce adopts the following resolution commending Senator BYRD for his courageous opposition to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act:

"Whereas Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JR., has eloquently defended and supported section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act before the U.S. Senate on behalf of his Virginia constituents; and,

"Whereas the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce desires to join Senator BYRD and the majority of Virginia's citizens in unalterably opposing repeal of section 14(b); and,

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States legislation which attempts to void the right-to-work laws of Virginia and 18 other States; and

"Whereas these State laws preserve the decision to join or not to join a labor union as an individual right left to the exercise of one's own conscience; and,

"Whereas Virginians admire their Senator's staunch defense of this law which permits Virginia and her sister States to prohibit unions and employers from forcing a person to join a union or be fired: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the board of directors of the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, in a meeting assembled at Evans Farm Inn, Fairfax County, Va., on February 8, 1966. That we hereby congratulate Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, JR., for his defense of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; and declares the chamber's continued unalterable opposition to its repeal; be it further

"Resolved, That all Representatives of Virginia serving in the Congress of the United States are urged to continue their support of this position."

La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus, Praises Appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver, as First Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the La Porte, Ind., Herald-Argus, of January 19, 1966, praising the appointment of the distinguished Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Dr. Robert C. Weaver.

The tribute and much deserved one to Dr. Weaver follows:

NEW CABINET POST

When the U.S. Senate confirmed without a dissenting voice appointment of Robert C. Weaver, as the first Negro in American history to sit in the President's Cabinet, a vital breakthrough for integration was achieved. It was an isolated example of the movement toward equality for the minority race. It was also recognition again that quality appointments rarely encounter roadblocks in the Senate. Weaver's abilities and qualifications are beyond question.

More important than Weaver's becoming the first of his race to occupy a Cabinet position is the fact of the new Federal Depart-

ment of Housing and Urban Development which he heads. When the issue of whether such a department should be created was before Congress there was doubt that such a Department was needed or desirable. Now there is more important evidence than ever that the American city typically is sick even while more people than ever flock within its gates.

It has been demonstrated too that the immense problems which create and multiply the illness cannot be met and solved by the municipalities alone, unaided and uncoordinated. There must be assistance, fiscal, technical, legal, from State and Federal Governments.

Seventy percent of us now live in urban areas, in cities and towns and suburbs. And the percentage grows higher with every passing day. As population increases the decay of the inner cores of our municipalities becomes more marked. The poor and underprivileged move in as the well to do leave. Tax base is lost. Slums and ghettos become worse. The automobile is choking the life out of the inner city as traffic multiplies much faster than ways to deal with it. Crime becomes a graver problem as the housing blight worsens. Downtown business areas shrink and suffer.

This urban malaise afflicts communities of all sizes and locations. The general problems are common all over the Nation. And they seem to grow more serious from year to year.

This brandnew Department has as its purpose the coordinating under Federal laws the rehabilitation and development of urban areas everywhere. It will be the agency devoted to helping cities and towns overcome the decay and the complex matters of transport, housing, beautification, health, safety, cultural growth. Every community will have to do much on its own, but the Federal agency should be the assisting means to great renewal and development in the teeming areas where by far most Americans live today.

The Serbian Fight for Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we join the Serbians throughout the world in commemorating the revolt for independence from the Turks which was led by the famed Karageorge. Unfortunately, the Serbian people are now captives of communism, and this great holiday is forbidden in their homeland by their present dictator, Tito.

On this historic day we must rededicate ourselves to our efforts to see that freedom is restored to the brave people of Serbia and all the other captives of communism.

The great Serbian leader Karageorge offered his life and fortune to rid Serbia of the oppressive rule of the Turks and the Serbians were victorious in their fight for independence and freedom. Serbia achieved international recognition when the Treaty of Bucharest was signed in 1812 and secured a limited autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, we must not only observe historic events such as the Serbian fight for independence in words, but in deeds as well. I urge, therefore, that a Special House Committee on Captive Nations be

established to study the present conditions of oppression under which the Serbians and other captive peoples are suffering.

Furthermore, the Voice of America should provide more effective and lengthier broadcasts to pierce the wall of Communist propaganda and deliver the truth to the brave people of Serbia. In recent years, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America has been reducing both its hours of broadcast in the Serbian language and in the nature of these broadcasts. The Voice of America gives only straight news and under present administration policy, is fearful of offending the Soviet Union. However, the brave Serbian people deserve the truth, and the Voice of America should give it to them in order that their resistance to communism be strengthened.

The Job Corps in Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Members of this body who have unjustly criticized the Job Corps, singling out Idaho for their attacks, may be enlightened on learning of the reaction in Idaho to their attempts to undermine the Nation's antipoverty program. I believe Lewiston Morning Tribune editorial writer Bill Hall has expressed very well the indignation of the average Idaho citizen.

The editorial, published on February 10, follows:

CONGRESSMEN, KIDS AND LAW OF THE JUNGLE

Young men being given the first opportunity of their lives to learn to read and write, to acquire the social graces and to become responsible citizens have enough of a burden without being poleaxed by politically motivated Congressmen in a sweeping and unfair generalization.

Representatives ALBERT H. QUIN, Republican, of Minnesota, and CHARLES E. GOODELL, Republican, of New York, have landed on an isolated incident at an Idaho Job Corps Center and pictured it as somehow typical of a program with which they disagree.

They have questioned the handling by Job Corps officials of a stabbing at the Mountain Home Center, saying it has encouraged corpsmen to believe that "the law of the jungle prevails" in the camp.

To assume one incident is somehow typical of the young men in the Job Corps makes about as much sense as assuming that all Congressmen are as irresponsible in their wild generalizations as Representatives QUIN and GOODELL.

Critics of the program have always been quick to jump to the inaccurate conclusions that Job Corps centers are populated only by young toughs from the big city. There are such types at the centers, but they are not in the majority, and they usually accept rehabilitation or wash out.

The Job Corps and its remarkable parent, the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, were never intended as Boy Scout camps. Most Boy Scouts don't require rehabilitation. They already know how to read and write, and they stand an excellent chance of learning a trade or going to college once they complete high school.

The bulk of the Job Corps men have little if any high school, they are largely unskilled and virtually unemployable. They were future candidates for the relief rolls and the Nation's prisons until the Job Corps provided them with an alternative.

It is commendable that this Nation is willing—over the objections of QUIN and GOODELL—to try to reclaim the few young toughs from the big cities who are enrolled. But the bulk of those enrolled in the Job Corps are from every section of the Nation. They are the children of southern sharecroppers, of Idaho indigents, and California fieldworkers. Some are orphans, the children of no one.

Anyone who believes the corps is a Government-sponsored gang of hoodlums should visit the Cottonwood Job Corps Center just outside of the town of Cottonwood. He will discover eager youngsters with a remarkable esprit de corps. And many of them do not take kindly to suggestions their camp is filled with incorrigibles. A reporter from this newspaper interviewed several Cottonwood corpsmen on that point last summer.

"That's a bunch of bunk," said one of them in what is probably an accurate appraisal of the comments this week by the two Congressmen.

Of course, some politicians out to shoot down a Federal program are not above using the material they have, whether it is representative or not.

Talk about law of the jungle.

Foreign Commercial Fishing Is Damaging Our Sports Fishing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, most of our citizens are unaware that the excellent sports fishing long available in the coastal waters bounding the North American Continent is being subjected to severe injury. This injury results chiefly from the entry of foreign fishing vessels into waters close to our coasts and the use by these vessels of commercial fishing techniques which take many tons of sports fish from the seas immediately off our shores. The consequence is that a major source of recreation for many thousands of persons is being damaged severely and the livelihood of the many persons who provide equipment and services to sports fishermen is affected adversely. The problem, as well as the difficulty of finding a good solution, is explained clearly in an article by Martin Kane in the January 31, 1966, issue of Sports Illustrated. This article was inserted in the RECORD for February 14, 1966, at page A713, by the distinguished Congressman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the public.

Mr. Speaker, I would support efforts which can legally be taken by appropriate authorities of our National Government to provide relief from this depredation. Such efforts should extend to negotiation of new international agreements if necessary.

Gains Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, having tried energetic and farflung efforts to negotiate a peace, this administration has now met with South Vietnamese leaders to establish better means of resisting aggression and meanwhile, to carry out extensive economic and social reforms.

What the Honolulu conference accomplished, according to the Washington Post, was "to bring together officials who are going to have to work together if the war is to be skillfully conducted and if the restoration of the country is to go forward." It was a good thing to bring them together.

I feel that the editorial makes a clear and honest summary of what was accomplished at the Honolulu conference, and with the conviction that others may want to see this article, I offer it for publication in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 10, 1966]

HONOLULU

The Honolulu conference did not produce any dramatic decisions to expand the war or any miracles to terminate it. There is no evidence that officials of either participating country expected it to do so, but apparently some of the spectators did. They are disappointed.

What the conference did do, and what it obviously was intended to do from the beginning, was to bring together officials who are going to have to work together if the war is to be skillfully conducted and if the restoration of the country is to go forward. It was a good thing to bring them together.

The statements by the two delegations and the communique issued Wednesday were notable for two declarations. One was the common declaration that the countries are in accord upon continued diplomatic efforts for peace. The other was the very evident reemphasis of joint objectives in favor of the reconstruction of the country and the achievement of political, social, and economic reforms.

The clarification of the positions of the two countries on these points alone would justify the conference. It certainly can be pointed out that General Ky's comments later indicate a continuing unwillingness to negotiate with the Vietcong that is not wholly in accord with American attitudes on the National Liberation Front. There is still work to be done on the joint bargaining position, but the Honolulu declarations make it clear that we are further along than we were when Secretary Rusk last visited Saigon.

The increased emphasis on social and economic programs is still on paper, and it needs urgently to be transferred into acts. The unfortunate people of South Vietnam are bearing the brunt of a disastrous and destructive war that is not in their interests alone, if our own declared objectives are to be believed. To them we have an obligation of conscience. The people of this country will support a vast expansion of expenditures for the care and rehabilitation and rescue of thousands of homeless people who have found themselves, through no fault of their own, in the midst of military operations.

More than 20 years of experience with the sponsor-client relationships between great

February 15, 1966

and small powers have not solved all of the problems involved in such difficult diplomatic relationships. Honolulu did not solve them either. They may be in large part insoluble. But if they are soluble at all it is by such efforts to arrive at a common understanding on objectives and means of reaching them. Misgivings have been expressed about the tendency of such high-level conferences to bind us more inseparably to the fate of a South Vietnam Government in which there are signs of instability. But the very act of waging a common war is an endeavor in which the participants cannot avoid a degree of intimacy or escape a certain identification with each other. It is a little late to do anything about that, much as it may worry us.

The administration made an energetic, if so far unsuccessful, effort to negotiate a peace. That having failed, it has set about trying to perfect better means of resisting aggression and reforming the economic and social conditions of South Vietnam. There does not seem to be any alternative.

Purpose Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker—

The war in Vietnam is long, hard, and costly. But it is a war for a worthy people's freedom. We applaud President Johnson's recognition of that fact.

These are the words of the Christian Science Monitor, which commends—in the strongest possible way—the firm stand taken by this administration to fight the war against Communist aggression, and to insist on measures which will give the people of that war-torn land an opportunity for a good and decent life.

The newspaper points out that the President's trip to Hawaii was vastly important because, for one reason, it brought the problems into sharper focus.

Its editorial quotes the President:

Our stand must be as firm as ever, * * * aggression must be stopped * * * those who counsel retreat * * * belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope.

As the Monitor says, these are very strong words, but they reestablish the fundamental and justifiable reason for American efforts and sacrifices in Vietnam.

In the firm belief that the Monitor's "Restatement of Purpose" editorial will be read by others with interest and enlightenment, I would like to make it available to them, and therefore ask that it be inserted in the Record.

The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 9, 1966]

RESTATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Now that President Johnson has gone to Hawaii, it suddenly becomes clear just how badly such a step had been needed. Although the visit has solved no problems, it has helped bring many of them back into

sharper focus. After nearly a month and a half of doubts, debates, peace efforts, disappointed hopes, and renewed bombings, it was apparent that some fundamental restatement of Washington's aims was necessary.

The President dealt bluntly with one of these aims when he said that "our stand must be as firm as ever," that aggression must be stopped, and that those who "counsel retreat * * * belong to a group that has always been blind to experience and deaf to hope." These are very strong words. But they are words which, so far as they go, reestablish the fundamental and justifiable reason for American efforts and sacrifices in Vietnam.

They must be and are accompanied by other words. These latter are a reiteration of Washington's determination to continue unflinchingly seeking peace while repelling imperialism. Simultaneously, we welcome the assurance that America will press forward far more strongly with the effort to reach and win over the uncommitted Vietnamese peasantry without whose sympathy the long-range outlook may well be hopeless.

We believe that the peasantry can be reached. Like people everywhere, the average Vietnamese wishes primarily to be left alone, to live in dignity, security, and moderate well-being. We believe that with a strong enough military effort, a sufficiently large portion of the countryside can be pacified to enable Saigon to put new and better conceived rural programs into effect. But this effort can never be made if Washington hesitates to commit the manpower, firepower, and machinepower necessary.

Regardless of what many say, we find it hard to believe that, at bottom, the Communist leaders in North Vietnam and within the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) are not realists. If Moscow has recognized (and there is reason to believe that it has) that the chance of a Communist military victory has gone, we see no reason to believe that Hanoi will not eventually become as perceptive.

Furthermore, the Communists have a graceful—and democratic—way out. They can still seek to win Vietnam in the only morally permissible way. This is through the ballot box and under a constitution which guarantees the freedom of all political points of view, a guarantee, incidentally, conspicuously inoperative in North Vietnam.

The war in Vietnam is long, hard, and costly. But it is a war for a worthy people's freedom. We applaud President Johnson's recognition of that fact.

How Do You Win?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there has been much confusion over the question of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Some critics charge that the Johnson administration has a no-win policy and is not doing enough with its military might.

Some light is thrown on this question by an editorial by Bob Gerhart in a recent issue of the New Era. The New Era is a weekly AFL-CIO paper published in Reading, Pa.

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial with my remarks:

How do you win in South Vietnam? That question, in my humble opinion, is the basic one which must be resolved before you can cast your vote for either the hawks (resume bombing) or the doves (don't resume bombing) in the increasingly costly and confusing tangle in Asia.

If you go back a few years when all we had in Saigon were so-called advisers, the big problem facing the South Vietnam regime was survival. Communists from the north had infiltrated villages, assumed community control, and developed a guerrilla operation that defied opposition. Presumably, the days were numbered for Saigon and fall of the nation's independence appeared to be imminent.

As a nation we were committed to help South Vietnam stay alive. Our advisers were increased, along with arms. A few provocations such as the Bay of Tonkin episode congealed the Nation's emotions and suddenly Uncle Sam had planted both feet in the land of rice. Then a theory emerged that if South Vietnam could hold off the northern raiders during the monsoon season it would be a simple matter for the United States to clean house and restore independence. Unfortunately that's not how the script evolved.

American forces, now numbering about 200,000 and still rising, established beachheads and patrols and began to move into the jungles and tall grass with the ubiquitous helicopters, ferreting out the elusive Cong. As GI Joes came face to face with the Communist warriors of the north, people here at home started talking tough and demanding the bombing of North Vietnam. That would knock the Vietcong out of the box, we were told.

But it didn't. If anything, the bombing hardened the determination and tenacity of the Communists to continue the battle, and they poured more men and weapons down the Ho Chi Minh trail in Laos. More American planes entered the fray, firing on foot soldiers, bombing ammunition and oil supplies, and generally harassing the Reds.

Meanwhile, here at home, the marchers walked for peace until President Johnson waged his global peace offensive and the North Vietnamese thumbed their nose at L.B.J.'s diplomatic overtures to every capital in the world. This peace offensive began during a Christmas truce and with the halting of bombing the north. President Johnson, a beleaguered man who faced one of the gravest decisions any human being could face, has resumed bombing.

It is in this context that the hawks screamed for resumption of bombing and the doves cooed that the bombing did no good when conducted previously and if resumed can only invite Communist retaliation against Saigon and other South Vietnam targets. The hawks make it sound as though bombing of the north will win the war. When you ask, "But what if the Chinese enter the fray?" the hawks fearlessly cry, "Then bomb China with nuclear weapons if necessary. But win we must." How do you win?

And suppose our nuclear bombing brings Russia in as an enemy, what then? "Bomb Russia, too," the hawks arrogantly cry. And what if we do bomb Russia and the Russians touch off intercontinental ballistic missiles which deliver nuclear warheads into Times Square in New York—or Detroit, Michigan—or Cape Kennedy and the rocket center at Houston? Who wins then?

You think it can't happen? Don't kid yourself. Once the trigger is pulled and world war III begins, we've reached the point of no return. This is what the doves in Washington are trying to say. They believe

that Americans and South Vietnam forces can consolidate their position in the south and gradually clean out pockets of resistance without raining bombs on North Vietnam and without leaving the South Vietnamese people defenseless. During such an interlude our economic and educational aid to the starving and injured people might bear fruit. And in the forum of world opinion we undoubtedly could reap goodwill in such large quantities that mankind would really respect us as a peace-loving nation commanding the respect of everyone. The doves do not propose withdrawal from the south leaving the people at the mercy of the ravaging Communists. But they do recognize that a stalemate, much like the one in Korea, is in the best interests of the American people and the human race. Standing firm on a line drawn by us is not appeasement. Hawks constantly need new prey to feed on. President Johnson should remember that his predecessor learned it the hard way, too—at the Bay of Pigs in Cuba.

VFW Commander Urges North Vietnam Ship Blockade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, recently the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Andy Borg, issued a statement calling for the establishment of a blockade against shipping into North Vietnam. Because of the deep concern of many in Congress and throughout the country about the continued assistance being rendered by free world ships especially, I believe that the views of the spokesman for one of our leading veterans' organizations clearly deserve wide circulation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the release entitled "VFW Commander Urges North Vietnam Ship Blockade":

VFW COMMANDER URGES NORTH VIETNAM SHIP BLOCKADE

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 8.—National commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Andy Borg, of Superior, Wis., today urged the immediate establishment of a blockade against shipping into North Vietnam.

Explaining the VFW position, Commander Borg said, "with the continuing intensification and growth of the war in South Vietnam the time has come to face up to the steady procession of ships delivering material to North Vietnam. These ships bring the weapons, bullets, and war material used to kill American troops and those of our allies."

"The way to stop this overseas support of the Communist aggression is to impose a quarantine type of blockade to prevent the warmaking cargoes from reaching North Vietnamese ports."

Continuing, Commander Borg said, "what is required is the kind of blockade or quarantine such as the late President Kennedy established around Communist Cuba during the missile crisis. Such a quarantine is not an act of war. It is essentially a means of preventing warmaking and war-supporting material from reaching the aggressor. Thus, an effective blockade would reduce the Communist warmaking ability and would be a

step toward ending the war. Such a quarantine—or Pacific blockade—is well recognized under international law. It could become an act of war only if the nations whose ships are blockaded decide to so consider it and attempt to shoot their way through."

"It is important to keep in mind," the VFW commander said, "that ships of the Soviet Union, when confronted by the quarantine in the missile crisis in Cuba, turned back and did not try to force their way through the blockade."

Commander Borg, who visited combat areas in South Vietnam recently, said that supply is a serious problem for the Communists in Vietnam. "It is extremely doubtful that the Communists could keep up organized aggression without the cargoes being brought into North Vietnam by ships."

"It is not generally appreciated," he said, "how much cargo is shipped into North Vietnam. For instance, in 1965 it's a reasonable estimate that there were well over 100 free world ships and probably an equal or larger amount of Soviet Union and other Communist-bloc ships making North Vietnamese ports. One of the most effective ways of reducing the Communist aggression is to cut off this seaborne flow of supplies. This will save lives and shorten the war."

Commenting on free world shipping into North Vietnam, the VFW commander said, "we would have no apologies to make to any free world nation for blockading their ships headed for Hanoi. Such trafficking with our enemy by ships flying free world flags is a betrayal of our friendship and a disservice to the cause of freedom throughout the world."

Concluding, Commander Borg said, "we have seapower superiority over communism in the Pacific and southeast Asia. There is no reason why we should not, therefore, exploit our advantage."

"If the United States could establish a quarantine blockade around Cuba, at a time when American troops were not getting killed, there is no reason why we shouldn't impose a similar quarantine against a vicious, aggressive enemy in North Vietnam who is killing American and allied fighting men."

Commander Borg emphasized that his recommendation for a blockade against North Vietnam was based upon a resolution unanimously adopted by the delegates representing the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans who are members of the VFW at their 1965 convention in Chicago.

Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the death of ALBERT THOMAS, Representative from Houston, is a particularly great loss to the Texas delegation, of which he was a senior member. An alumnus of two fine Texas institutes of higher learning—Rice University and the University of Texas, he was also a veteran of World War I and a distinguished attorney at law. He came to Washington some 30 years ago to distinguish himself further, this time as a U.S. Congressman. As the years passed, he became an important member of the House Committee on Appropriations, heading several key sub-

committees, and serving on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

But it is not just for his great public service that I shall remember ALBERT THOMAS. I shall first and foremost forever cherish my remembrance of him as a fine human being and as my friend. When I first came to Congress in 1963, Mr. THOMAS was a great help to me in learning the fine details of the legislative process. Always considerate and gracious, he was what I think a true gentleman must be. A Democrat who contributed greatly to his party, he was liked and admired by Democrats and Republicans alike. He was my friend, and I shall truly miss him. But even more important to note here today is that the loss of this fine Member of Congress will be felt by the Nation for many years to come. The place of such a fine gentleman as ALBERT THOMAS is not easily filled in the world today.

Can Vietnam War Be Won?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the more one reads of the incredible obstacles that confront those who are trying to save Vietnam, the more serious becomes the question of whether the government of that country will permit it to be saved.

The odyssey of Mr. H. G. Beck, master of the SS *Louise Lykes*, as related to his employers from Saigon, is almost impossible to believe. It is a story of incompetence at its worst. It is a story of waste of the American taxpayers' money that ought to make every citizen of this country shudder.

Here was a vessel, carrying a combined cargo of rice and military supplies, the master of which almost had to fight a war to deliver free to a nation which claims to be fighting a war.

But read the report. It follows:

SS "LOUISE LYKES,"

Saigon, Vietnam, December 28, 1965.

Mr. R. T. RECKLING,
Assistant Vice President, Operations, Lykes
Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., New Orleans,
La.

DEAR SIR: Following is a report on the delays encountered at Da Nang, Vietnam:

On the way from Japan to Da Nang we followed our usual custom of sending our estimated time of arrival as soon as possible. Since we could not contact the local station at Danang advised both Manila and Saigon, requesting the latter to inform Danang. We happened to hear that the "old" *Louise Lykes* was at Da Nang and after that sent our messages through the old *Louise* to pass to the agent at Da Nang. We were informed by the agent, through the *Louise* that we would have a delay of at least 3 weeks before we would start discharging due to the arrival of a Liberian vessel with 14,000 tons of rice the previous day, we passed the information on to Manila.

December 17: Arrived off Da Nang at 8 p.m., but due to heavy weather stayed outside and hove to, but reported our arrival to the harbor entrance control, requesting an an-

chorage. We had talked to the *Christopher Lykes*, which was also in the bay and were advised not to attempt to enter as the vessels in the bay experienced very heavy swells and high winds. We had no intention of entering as we had listened to phone calls from vessels stating that they were dragging their anchors, requesting new anchorages.

December 18: Approached the entrance to the bay at daybreak and hove to 3 miles off, reporting and requesting again to have an anchorage assigned to us. The weather had moderated somewhat, but we could not see the land due to constant rain squalls. Finally, at 1 p.m., received instructions to anchor 280 degrees, 4,800 yards from Observatory Light. Entered and anchored in the middle of the bay, rolling very heavily and shipping water on deck, laying broadside to the swells entering the bay. Talked to old *Louise* and to the *Christopher*, both of whom informed us that they had not seen the agent in a couple days due to the bad weather. Sent a message to the agent through the local station informing him of our arrival.

December 19: No contact yet, no news. Informed by another vessel that the "agent will be out tomorrow." Vessel neither entered nor cleared. Lykes Manila wanted to know best draft we could trim to. Informed Manila best draft 30 feet, 6 inches.

December 20: Agent did not come aboard. No contacts.

December 21: Received message from agent through local station, "Wait instructions advice from Saigon" Centraco. Received message from Manila quoting concern of New Orleans regarding delay at Danang, requesting we explore possibilities of debunkering at Danang to *Louise*, *Christopher*, *Ruth*, or any vessel. Called *Christopher* on the phone, were told that agent was aboard *Christopher*, passed a message from us to agent, also passed message from Manila to agent, at the same time demanding that agent come out to vessel immediately. When the agent came aboard it became apparent at once that there was absolutely nothing that he could do to assist us. Rather than risk further delay went with agent to *Louise* to explore possibility of giving bunkers to *Louise* which needed them.

Found that *Louise* had neither hose nor fittings and neither did we. Conditions for coming alongside in this port are extremely hazardous due to swell at times. An old oil barge which we were going to use as a fender between the vessels was found to have sunk in the meantime. Since the *Louise* was ready to sail by this time we continued ashore with the agent in order to talk to MSTs but were told that they had neither barges, hose, nor fittings, that they would explore possibilities and let us know. Talking to the *Christopher* we found that she could take 8,000 barrels, had hose, and could make some sort of fittings. But then the question of camels or fenders arose. We could not go in where she was due to our draft, she was MSTs and working at the time. MSTs had to be contacted, the Navy or fenders located somewhere.

Before we could pursue the matter further we received a message from Manila to "proceed Manila for debunkering acknowledge advising ETA." We had advised Manila regarding our efforts and failure up to then. We might have succeeded in the end, but valuable time would have been lost as it would have taken a minimum of a day or more to coordinate everything, then possibly another day, with the ever-present possibility of swell or the inability to obtain suitable fenders.

Advised the local authorities, harbor entrance control, port control, the agent through the *Suomico* a USNS tanker, that we were leaving as soon as we had steam up. In the meantime we were still trying to contact the *Ruth Lykes* at Cam Ranh Bay, ap-

parently a very sheltered place, but were unable to raise her. Called the local control stations, since they are in touch with each other, explaining our difficulties, requesting permission to use the channel. While sympathetic they did not want to be bothered, but suggested that we use the local Western Union. We would have gotten an answer in a week. MSTs was going to advise us what they had come up with. We asked how, by phone? They said their phone did not reach across the street, they had no insulators on their antennas. Going ashore with the agent we had to wait first while the boat crew repaired or made adjustments to the motor. Going ashore it became doubtful whether we would be getting back to the ship again. Communications are extremely poor.

Sent some radios to Saigon, asking if we could debunker at Cap St. Jacques, if we could obtain barges, hoses, fittings? No answer. We could not raise Cam Ranh Bay. Later I found out that efforts were being made at Saigon along those lines, in fact were in progress while we were calling, but ended in failure for one reason or another. Knowing we have a message at a station we would call for an hour or two before they would deign to answer. Saigon for instance sends her traffic at certain hours and you either catch the station then or not at all. Many times other ships would relay for us and we would do the same as otherwise no one would get any messages through except possibly a few lucky ones.

December 22: Sailed from Da Nang at 12:30 a.m. and at 9 a.m. advised Manila that we had sailed, giving our estimated time of arrival, Manila. Received orders at the same time canceling the diversion, telling us to keep in touch with Manila, in the meantime to remain at Da Nang. Since we were already 160 miles from Da Nang slowed down, heading south and awaited developments. Since jettisoning fuel was mentioned we were in position to do so any time we were ordered to commence.

We remained in touch with Manila and Saigon throughout the day and night, receiving and answering instructions, passing messages from Manila to Saigon, adding our own requests. In the meantime continued steaming south slowly in order to be able to proceed either Manila or Saigon as ordered, at the same time to be near enough Saigon to insure making the tide if ordered to jettison fuel.

December 23: at 1:30 a.m., informed Manila that we were starting to jettison fuel as the deadline had arrived to jettison, staying far enough offshore and at the same time make the tide on the 24th, adding if objection advise immediately. No answer came back, so we continued to jettison until we felt we were light enough to be able to proceed upriver on the tide. I had left myself time as I did not know how long it would take to jettison that much fuel, also the speed the ship would make once we started steaming again. We did not want to jettison, then fail to make the tide. It seems our worries were unfounded. Completed jettisoning at 4 p.m. and started for Cap St. Jacques making 20 knots.

During the night, after we picked up the first landmarks, slowed down in order to enter Cap St. Jacques during daylight hours. Arrived and anchored off the Cape at 8 a.m. Read the draft as well as we could both forward and aft and amidships, port and starboard and came to the conclusion that we were on the draft we were supposed to be on. We still had water in the forepeak which we were going to use to trim, but did not use it for fear of tipping the vessel aft too much. We had figured that we would have to pump half of it out, but left well enough alone.

Orders came out by boat saying that we would proceed upriver about 1400, also asking the draft. Informed pilots 29 feet 2 inches, as read. When the pilot came aboard he also

asked, we told him 29 feet 2 inches, or 29 feet 10 inches fresh water. When we crossed the bar, apparently a mere two or three ship lengths, the vessel never hesitated, did not slow down, did not stir up mud, just kept steaming as before. On arrival at Saigon the draft was found to be 30 feet 3 inches forward and 29 feet 11 inches aft. The only berth available were buoys at the lower end of the harbor. The distance between these buoys is insufficient for a vessel of this size, so we made one buoy fast alongside of the bow and using an anchor, in order to have the after buoy astern of the vessel. While being cleared by the local authorities we were informed the discharge would commence Christmas Day at 7 p.m.

December 25: Barges alongside at 7 p.m., but no labor. It seems that barge people had advised everyone that barges could not be alongside before 2200. No work this day.

December 26: USOM and AID people aboard with agent. Commander Fink of USOM informed me that he had been trying to line up a large fuel barge to debunker us at Cap St. Jacques. At the same time use junks and barges to discharge part of the rice while debunkering. He was going to bring the vessel into the river above Cap St. Jacques in order to be in quiet water and had arranged for a naval patrol to see that we were not surprised by the Vietcong. Labor costs would have been tripled sending stevedores that distance (40 miles), but it would have been still cheaper than jettisoning. But he could not get anywhere with his plan due to the obstructionist attitude of the local government. He stated that we needed a permit to discharge at the river-mouth, then there would be trouble bringing the rice to Saigon. When pointing out that the rice was destined to Vietnam and that Cap. St. Jacques is in Vietnam as is Danang he merely shrugged his shoulders saying that he could not force people, that he could merely advise them. I could only agree with him, having dealt with the same people.

Labor boarded the vessel at 1430 this day and knocked off again at 1500. The receiver had failed to obtain a permit at the customhouse to discharge into lighters. No work this day. Informed Manila by radio.

December 27, 9 a.m.: Two gentlemen from AID aboard accompanied by a Colonel Jock(?) from CPA, the Vietnamese Government agency receiving the rice. I asked him regarding the debacle the previous day when the discharge of badly needed rice was stopped for the lack of a piece of paper, which is given by one Government agency (customs) to another (receiver) which after all is only a matter of form. In the meantime a very expensive ship is being held up. He drew his whole 5 feet up and stated that we do not work on Saturday and Sunday. This did not sit too well with me and I pointed out that I not only worked on Saturday and Sunday, but day and night, every day, so did everyone else, the crew, the AID people, the people loading the ship at home, in fact everyone and one sure thing, the Vietcong were working. It made no impression on the gentleman at all. The AID people took off in high dudgeon telling the colonel that they would see the Minister, whoever he is, some Vietnamese Cabinet officer.

At 1315 five gangs came aboard and started discharging Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. During the day Mr. T. Gleason and five aids came aboard accompanied by Commander Fink, USOM. They are here, as you probably are aware, to use their talents in unsnarling the local bottleneck by improving coordination, using labor and barges and other facilities intelligently. I received the impression that Mr. Gleason has been here since October, but from all I can gather while they know where and what the trouble is, there is very little that they can do except advise. You might as well advise the rice to get out under

its own power, you get just as far as advising the local yokels. You think you have troubles?

Mr. Gleason and his gang came back later during the day. We still had five gangs working and continued to do so until 2315 when the barges at Nos. 2 and 5 were loaded and no replacements had arrived. The rest continued until 0500 the next morning when the shift ended and the barge at No. 3 was loaded.

December 28: At 0730 five gangs came aboard, two went to work at Nos. 5 and 6, while the gangs at Nos. 2, 3, and 4 stood by, waiting for barges. Apparently they only get paid while they work, because at 10 o'clock, when a half a dozen barges showed up the labor was gone. Mr. Gleason, ILA and aids, with a gentleman from AID came aboard again, watching operations for a while, pointing out that the load was always hanging in the air, waiting to be lowered in the opening in the roof of the barge. The opening is at one end and the cargo, or rice, has to be carried clean to the other end in the barge. Mr. Gleason stated that he had forwarded a report to Washington in October, pointing out that they needed large flat barges, land the cargo on them and cover it. That is all that happened, no one paid any attention to it. At the present moment we have four rice ships here now.

Apparently the rice is not needed as badly as we think. I heard an aside between the AID people, saying: "What are we going to do with it, they are harvesting in the delta and they will come up with another 200,000 tons."

At the present moment we have six empty barges alongside (2 p.m.) but no labor on the barges to land and stow the rice in the barges. While the rice is checked off the ship, it also must be checked on to the barge. The barge checkers have not shown up either.

I am writing this little epistle from notes which I am trying to keep in chronological order. If they are confusing, or if you are confused, think nothing of it, so am I. I keep asking questions, prodding the agent and stevedore, but half the time I do not know what they are talking about, because while I received excellent training during my 3-year sojourn in Turkey, these people can teach the Turks when it comes to procrastinating and evading. The agent and stevedore both are doing their best apparently, but it is also apparent that it is not good enough.

We discharged some 1,350 tons of rice yesterday up until 5 a.m. today in what may be called 2 interrupted shifts (lack of barges etc.). However, most, if not all the discharged cargo is still alongside. The cargo has to be discharged into warehouses some distance from here and the barges returned for further loading. If the local people could coordinate their efforts it would be only a matter of days to discharge a vessel such as this, but either there is no labor, or no checkers, or no barges, or the tide is wrong or too strong or even the lack of a piece of paper which nullifies all efforts. I have been informed by Mr. Gleason that there is no trouble getting labor at any time of the day or night, so there should be no trouble on that score.

So far the military cargo has not been touched. I understand that we will probably have to shift to another berth in order to unload, unless the military are willing to unload their vehicles into barges. It is too early to start prodding as some of the stuff is still buried by the rice, even though No. 1 can be discharged now.

I hope the foregoing is what you had in mind when you requested that I inform you of any and all delays. A detailed log will also be kept and forwarded prior to sailing from Saigon. In order to keep this epistle down to manageable size I shall close now, continue

to keep notes and complete it before sailing from here.

Yours very truly,

H. G. BECK, Master.

Mistakes of McNamara Are Danger to Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the pressure to do something about the multiplying McNamara errors in judgment is increasing with the unfolding of every day. A good example of the temperament of my constituency is contained in the following article entitled "Mistakes of McNamara Are Danger to Nation," by Henry J. Taylor which recently appeared in the San Diego Union is in the must-read category for my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this as a portion of my remarks:

MISTAKES OF McNAMARA ARE DANGER TO NATION

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Another of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's great plans has folded under him (and under our men in Vietnam) like a dying camel. But who would know it?

This war is not the administration's war. It's the American people's war. And the truth we fail to get is utterly—shamefully—appalling.

Once again, in the largest matters Mr. McNamara's judgment apparently vanishes like a pricked balloon.

Among other examples, the records show him dead wrong, successively wrong and wrong on all sides of the Vietnam situation. In February 1962, Mr. McNamara stated: "By every quantitative measure we are winning the war in Vietnam." And so it goes with Mr. McNamara.

Now it's about ships. And this brings us to the facts herein; just one more example, but you can frame it:

In testifying to Congress 4 years ago after returning from Vietnam, Mr. McNamara stated he had decided to take ships largely out of the defense picture. Air transport would be substituted as our primary military supply vehicle. This would take the place of ships "we do not need."

Were Mr. McNamara's computers just spinning their reels? Representative Edward A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland, acting chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, and others apparently told him it would take 260 of the C5A planes to carry the load of a single C-4-type work-horse ship. And it would cost eight times as much per ton mile.

Flanked by his whiz kids, fresh from their computers, the answer was Mr. McNamara's same old yakety-yak of leave-it-to-me, a-one, a-two, a-three.

Well, here it is 4 years later and what is the truth about what's happened? By the Defense Department's own records, 2 of every 3 soldiers in Vietnam had to be transported by ships. As of January 24, 98 percent of the cargo and supplies for the war went in ships.

But because Mr. McNamara was wrong we haven't got the ships. Instead, our fighting men have got the shortages in Vietnam.

When will Mr. McNamara admit that Vietnam cargoes are piling up scandalously in

New York, New Orleans, Oakland, Norfolk, and Baltimore? When will he admit the few ships he has belatedly reactivated cannot unload their cargoes fast enough to get back here and take on the supplies that are piling up?

When will he admit that even these few ships often wait in Vietnam sometimes nearly 3 months, with their supplies undelivered to our troops because the ships arrive to find no suitable unloading conditions?

In July, Mr. McNamara finally caved in to the extent of (quietly) reactivating 50 ships, and then another 25 or so, from our mothball fleet. But he demanded a 10-cent job for their refitting, and practically no time for testing.

Water, instead of detergent, was quickly pumped through the boiler tubes. It resulted in a scandal. But who would know it? Unremoved oil sediment and sludge caused boiler after boiler to blow up or break down at sea.

Accordingly, Mr. McNamara now needs ships so badly and so fast that there isn't time to refit enough in time to move the cargoes.

Mr. McNamara's computer-backed words are convincing. His housekeeping in the Defense Department is splendid and his remarkable intelligence fully deserves the praise received. But intelligence is not the same as good judgment. And at top levels no man can claim to have good judgment who fails to make allowances for the consequences if he is wrong.

This is the first requirement of good judgment. Yet Mr. McNamara repeatedly bets the very essence of our national security that he's right, with no place for us to turn if he's wrong.

To be that bullheaded, that positive you are right, is dangerous. On his record in the big questions that really count most, Mr. McNamara should resign.

Tribute to the Honorable Albert Thomas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the loss of ALBERT THOMAS, as a Representative of the State of Texas and as a symbol of great statesmen is an irreplaceable one.

My admiration for him began during my first days as a Member of Congress from the State of New York.

All of the outstanding attributes for which the image seekers of today search, veritably shone in the great mind, the wit and above all, the character of Congressman THOMAS. I hasten to join in tribute today with my colleagues. He was a gentleman and a scholar.

His magnificent verbal sparring on the floor of the House of Representatives, either in the presentation of a supplemental budget or in his flawless elucidation of an argument, was eagerly anticipated by each and every Member of Congress.

I am grateful to have served with Congressman THOMAS in his capacity as chairman of the Democratic caucus and I am proud to have called him my colleague.